



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





Harvard Divinity School



ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

MDCCCXX

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

*Gift of Miss Haven, Boston  
July 1914*

















Plate I

Fontenoy.



**THE HISTORY**  
**OF**  
**THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,**  
**AND OF**  
**WALTHAM ABBEY.**  
**WITH THE**  
**APPEAL OF INJURED INNOCENCE.**

**BY THOMAS FULLER, D.D.,**

**PREBENDARY OF SARUM. &c. &c.**

**AUTHOR OF "THE WORTHIES OF ENGLAND," "THE HOLY STATE," "THE  
HISTORY OF THE HOLY WAR," "PISGAH-SIGHT OF PALESTINE,"  
"ABEL REDIVIVUS," &c. &c.**

**A NEW EDITION.**

**WITH NOTES,**

**BY JAMES NICHOLS,**

**EDITOR OF FULLER'S "CHURCH HISTORY OF BRITAIN," &c.**

**LONDON :**  
**PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG, 73, CHEAPSIDE.**

---

**1840.**

ANDOVER-HARVARD  
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

OCT 22 1914

HARVARD  
DIVINITY SCHOOL

H 42,815

LONDON :  
PRINTED BY JAMES NICHOLS,  
46, HOKTON-SQUARE.



J51.455  
C178  
F968hi  
PREFACE.

---

THIS large volume contains three distinct productions, all of them necessary to the completion of FULLER's "Church History;" who, after recording in chronological order the founders, benefactors, and celebrated men of the various Colleges in Oxford, repeatedly directs his readers to "the History of the University of Cambridge," (the first of these three works,) for the corresponding information respecting the foundations, benefactions, and eminent persons of the latter University, of which he was a distinguished member; and to his venerable *Alma Mater*, as the reader will perceive, he has proved himself to be a dutiful son, rendering her all due honour and respect in this promised History, which has been received as the accredited guide of every subsequent academical historian.

The second is a brief "History of Waltham Abbey in Essex," of which Fuller was the curate in the latter years of the Inter-regnum, through the kindness of his right honourable friend and patron, the earl of Carlisle; to whom he dedicates the small book, and of whose ancestors he has given a delightful description in the dedication prefixed to the fourth book of his "Church History." This was one of the methods by which Divine Providence at that time preserved several of the eminent episcopal clergy from the common ruin and dispersion of their order, and from the rancorous molestation of their determined enemies. In the first sentence of "the History," he gratefully acknowledges the loving-kindness of his Heavenly Father in "having planted" him in such a calm retreat; and expresses a hope, that his endeavours to describe it "may prove exemplary to others, who dwell in the sight of remarkable monasteries, to do the like, and rescue the observables of their habitations from the teeth of time and oblivion,"—an exhortation which, certainly, has not been without effect, as may be seen in the multitude of good local Histories which soon afterwards made their appearance.

The third and most important work is "the Appeal of injured Innocence," which occupies more than one half of the present large volume; and is, in fact, a run-

## PREFACE.

ning commentary on each of the eleven books of the “Church History,”—the “History of Cambridge” being generally reckoned as the twelfth. On another occasion I have declared, what I now repeat, concerning it:—“Published in the year prior to the Restoration, it displays to better advantage, perhaps, than any or all of his former productions, the multifarious acquirements and wonderful intellectual resources of Fuller. Highly as I am reputed to venerate his antagonist, Peter Heylin, that staunch and sturdy royalist, I feel no hesitation in pronouncing Fuller the victor in this contest; not only from the general justness of his cause, but also for that which exalts him as a man and a Christian,—his playful wit, ingenuous candour, almost unfailing good-humour, and remarkable moderation.” It embraces almost every topic within the range of human disquisition, from the most sublime mysteries of the Christian religion and the great antiquity of the Hebrew and Welsh languages, down to “the tale of a tub” and criticisms on Shakspeare’s perversion of the character of sir John Falstaff. But the value of “the Appeal” cannot be too highly estimated when it is known to contain the discordant views of two eminent churchmen,—the one classing himself with the *high* party, the other with the *low*,—on most momentous events in which they had themselves been actors, or of which they had been thoughtful spectators, and on principles and motives the temperate discussion of which will always be interesting to the sincere lover of truth, but which must be considered as of paramount importance to us in these days, when many of the same arguments are reproduced and brought into fresh collision. Yet it is gratifying to contemplate the state of amicable concord into which these two great masters of attack and defence were ultimately brought, respecting all the great principles which had been the subjects of their debate, after each of them had tendered his own opinion or explanation. On the matters of fact which concerned Fuller as an author,—who was then put on his literary trial before the public, to be declared worthy or unworthy of obtaining general credence,—the results are favourable in the extreme; and such as tend fully to establish his reputation with posterity for a veritable historian, who wrote and published his great work, and this large defence of it, in troublous

times, when the recent political and religious agitations had scarcely been suffered to subside.

After perusing the instances of personal vanity which I have given in a note, (p. 396,) the reader will be prepared to divine the true cause of Heylin's infelicitous attack on Fuller in his *Examen Historicum*. He possessed great irritability of disposition; yet, like most men of warm temperament, he seems to have been scarcely conscious of this infirmity, and undoubtedly wrote the following sentence in great sincerity of heart:—"The party whom I am to deal with is so much a stranger to me, that he is neither *beneficio nec injuriâ notus*; and therefore no particular respects have moved me to the making of these Animadversions." Fuller's reply to this is highly characteristic:—"I am glad to hear this passage from the Animadvertor, *that I never did him any injury*; the rather because some of my friends have charged me for provoking his pen against me. And though I pleaded, that neither in thought, word, nor deed, I ever did him any wrong, I hardly prevailed with them for belief: and now the Animadvertor hath cleared me, that I *never* did any injury unto him." In this sentence will be discerned much of that sly waggery which "peeps out, ever and anon," in Fuller's pages. He was himself evidently well aware of the existence of some cause of offence on his part; and, notwithstanding his honest declaration to the contrary, Heylin has shown, (p. 449,) how much he was annoyed by a passage in "the History of Cambridge," (p. 117,) in which Fuller mentions the reply of king Henry VI. to bishop Wainfleet; "a speech," says Fuller, "avouched by NO HISTORIAN," though in the same paragraph he asserts it to have been "first printed by Brian Twyne, Oxford Antiquary, and afterwards related by *Dr. Heylin, a member of that University*." In another passage, (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 148,) he had described "St. Equitius, the pretended founder of our first English monks," in this style:—"But be he who he himself or any other pleaseth, (brother, if they will, to St. George on horseback,) he was never father of any monks in England." This roused the choler of Heylin, who prided himself on being the author of the very amusing "History of that most famous Saint and Soldier of Christ Jesus, St. George of Cappadocia;" and he



has given expression to his kindled indignation in no measured terms. ("Appeal," p. 476.) This excitement, from similar slight and unintentional offences, induced him to employ low and abusive language, a specimen of which I give below in a note,\* in which the manly and witty answer of Fuller, must confirm the good opinion which all well-natured men will have formed of his vast superiority in the delightful essentials of temper and genius.

In the "Appeal" it was the author's intention, as he announces it, (p. 291,) "to deal more fairly with the Animadvertor" than the latter had dealt with him; "and not here and there to pick out parcels, and cut off shreds," he says, "where they make most for my advantage; but I have presented *the whole cloth of his book*," &c. He proceeded in this honest course, of fully quoting his adversary's words and immediately subjoining his own reply, till he received an intimation from Heylin's *stationer*, (as the respectable *publisher* of those days was commonly designated,) that the faithful reprint of the entire work would operate to his pecuniary injury. Fuller therefore renders this, with other reasons, ("Appeal," p. 508,) why he should omit all further redundancies,

\* DR. HEYLIN.—How wise the rest were, I am not able to say. But certainly our author showed himself "no wiser than Waltham's calf, who ran nine miles to suck a bull and came home athirst," as the proverb saith. His running unto Oxford, which cost him as much in seventeen weeks, as he had spent in Cambridge in seventeen years, was but a second sally to the first knight-errantry.

FULLER.—I can patiently comport with the Animadvertor's *jeers*; which I behold as so many frogs, that it is pretty and pleasing to see them hop and skip about, having not much harm in them. But I cannot abide his *railings*; which are like to toads, swelling with venom within them. Any one may rail who is bred but in Billingsgate-College: and I am sorry to hear such language from the Animadvertor, a Doctor in Divinity; seeing railing is as much *beneath* a Doctor, as against Divinity.

When Dr. Turner, a physician sufficiently known, gave the lie (at the earl of Pembroke's table) to the earl of Carnarvon: "I will take the lie from you;" replied the earl, "but I will never take physic from you." If such railing be consistent with the Doctor's Divinity, this once I will take *the calf*, but never learn Divinity from him.

Two things comfort me under his reviling. First. That no worse man than David himself complained, that he became "a PROVERB to his enemies," Psalm lxix. 2. Secondly. Though *a calf* be a contemptible creature, passing for the emblem, not (with the dove) of simplicity, but of plain silliness; yet is it a clean one, and accepted of God for sacrifice, Heb. ix. 19. Whereas the snarling dog (though a creature of far more cunning and sagacity) was so odious and unclean, that by a peculiar law it was provided, that the price of a dog should not be brought into the house of God. Deut. xxiii. 18.—"Appeal of injured Innocence," p. 519.

“which might well be spared, as containing no pungent matter against” any of his facts or positions. But since this necessity no longer exists, I have rendered the present edition much more valuable, by inserting in it THE WHOLE OF HEYLIN’S ANIMADVERSIONS, contained in that very scarce book the general title of which is *Examen Historicum*; thus the reader may obtain, at one view, a sight of the occasionally powerful reasonings of these two great oracles on affairs ecclesiastical.

For the principles on which I undertook the superintendence of this edition of FULLER’S works, as well as for a more ample list of words which have been slightly altered, and of those which have become their substitutes, I refer the reader to my preface to his “Church History.” Of those principles, and of that excellent work itself, the Christian portion of the public have shown their approbation by the purchase of a large impression. A new edition of it is now in progress through the press, and it shall be my care to render it still more deserving of general patronage.

In conformity with my practice in the “Church History” I now subjoin a list of such words as I have changed for others, their cognates in meaning and derivation:—

*Absorpt* into absorbed; *accrewed*, accrued; *advowances*, advowsons; *Anglized*, Anglicized; *Arabie*, Arabia; *Authentique*, authentic.

*Bandeleur*, Bandeleer; *baronrie*, barony; *belfree*, belfry; *bin*, been; *bodys*, bodice; *bone-fire*, bonfire; *boy up*, buoy up; *Britannie*, Britannia; *broak*, broken; *by like*, belike.

*Caused way*, causeway; *champion*, champaign; *complements*, compliments; *consultive*, consultative; *controller*, comptroller; *coules*, cowl; *counters*, compts; *cousen*, cozen; *creeketh*, creaketh; *crue*, crew.

*Deceipt*, deceit; *delatory*, dilatory; *dispoyled*, despoiled; *durty*, dirty.

*Empaire*, impair; *emperesse*, empress; *enhaunced*, enhanced; *eremitical*, hermitical; *errant*, arrant; *essay* of bread, assay; *estrich*, ostrich; *excheator*, escheator.

*Feacible*, feasible; *ferrie*, ferry; *forrain*, foreign; *frey*, fray.

*Gage*, gauge; *gentile*, genteel; *gipsous*, gypseous; *Gothish*, Gothic.

*Harraged*, harassed; *hospital*, hospitable; *hufte*, huff; *hungerly*, hungrily.

*Ile*, aisle. *Jeast*, jest; *Jewrie*, Jewry. *Launces*, lances; *lushious*, luscious.

*Marish*, marsh; *minstre*, minster; *moe*, more. *Ne*, not; *nibble*, nipple.

*Pickt and chose*, picked and chosen; *portraicture*, portraiture; *priced*, prized; *prizing*, pricing; *proling*, prowling; *publique*, public; *puntillos*, punctilios; *pusnie*, puisne.

*Redowneth*, redoundeth; *retrence*, retrench; *rere*, rear; *rivolet*, rivulet; *roundled up*, rounded up; *rythme*, rhyme.

*Skeleton*, skeleton; *scited*, sited; *sithence*, since; *slenting*, slanting; *spook*,

spoke ; *stander-bearer*, standard-bearer ; *stoage*, stowage ; *straighten*, straiten ; *sute*, suit ; *swoound*, swoon ; *synonymaes*, synonymes.

*Thorow*, through ; *thoroughly*, thoroughly ; *tole*, toll ; *tressel*, trestle.

*Unshakened*, unshaken ; *unvaluable*, invaluable ; *userers*, usurers.

*Vicaridge*, vicarage ; *vice-count*, viscount ; *virge*, verge.

*Weike*, wick ; *when as*, whereas ; *whiles*, while ; *wrastled*, wrestled.

The following is a brief list of similar words from HEYLIN'S *Examen Historicum* :—

*Accompted*, accounted. *Bed-roll*, bead-roll. *Cassacks*, cassocks ; *cruel night-cap*, crewel. *Enditath*, inditeth ; *escocheon*, escutcheon. *Failers*, failures. *Gothish*, Gothic. *Huishers*, ushers. *Interesse*, interest. *Same-terie*, cemetery. *When as*, whereas.

I now subjoin a collection of the principal words, which, for various reasons, I have retained, though they are seldom employed in modern writing :—

Accustomably, adequation, additory, amortize, amotion, approved on, asselfeth, (affiliates itself,) assoiled. Be-rebussed, budge. Cassate, catchingness, cheverel expressions, chiefest, co-evity, commends, (commendation,) composure, (composition,) consulatory, (consular,) contrariant, contempered, convented, coparcenary, courtlike, (courtly,) courtship, (courtliness). Derived into, defalk, dilatations, disparateness. Engrand, (aggrandize,) errats, (errata,) to estate, equivale. Farced. Give a gird, (cast a sneer,) grinded. Hang-byes, hollow (to shout). Informative, inhold, (withhold,) insculped, insculption, inunded, (inundated). Jocular. Launder, (laundress,) leiger-books, (ledgers,) lousing, loveday. Magnisecant, managery, manc, Mezentism. Now-of-days. Partage, penetral, (the bowels,) precessor, preposed, (set over,) proprietaries, (proprietors,) posthume. Retractions, remised, (remitted,) robustious. Septemfluous, signeth, (assigneth,) sinisterity, sleighting, smatch, (taste,) sopited, spick-and-span new, staple, (firm,) suppletory. Tentations, tituled, (styled,) trounced (punished). Unshakened, un-universitied. Vestiary (vestry). Ware-trash.

Four words of the same class from Heylin are here subjoined :—

Batable, (debatable,) infeodations, inheretrices, (female heirs,) tendry.

To some of the words here enumerated, and to a few others, I have subjoined short notes, principally etymological : Such as, *fur*, p. 71 ; *doubty*, 98 ; *ware-trash*, 107 ; *cousens*, 117 ; *attendancy*, 233 ; *drift*, 280 ; *abhominal libels*, 517 ; *at-one*, 578 ; and *betine*, 612. A few larger notes will also be found ; as that on *Heylin's pride of ancestry*, p. 396 ; *Fuller's excellent memory*, 447 ; *Dr. Cheynel*, 495 ; on *Fuller's name*, 532 ; *Jewel and Case*, 576 ; *William Prynne*, 582 ; *Dr. Cosin*, 660, 669 ; and *Brook and Lake*, 684.

Beside these, I have inserted two notes of considerable length. The first occurs in pp. 241–252, and details the *incunabula* and subsequent pre-eminence of mathe-

matical studies in the University of Cambridge, with brief allusions to some collateral topics. The second will be found in pp. 673–683 ; and exhibits the ecclesiastical speculations of Dr. Cornelius Burgess during the Inter-regnum, and their infelicitous termination. Without that introduction, the reader will perceive, Fuller's letter to him would have been utterly unintelligible. In every case, I have shown a decent respect to my readers, as well as to the character of my author, by appending to my own notes the brief signature of "EDIT."

The difficulties encountered by an author who passed through the press, in the unsettled times of the Commonwealth, such large productions as the "Church History" and its accompaniments, cannot be adequately conceived by any of those who have been nursed, amidst learned leisure, in the lap of peace and plenty. In the dedication of the fifth book of his "Church History" to the earl of Middlesex, Fuller very eloquently laments the dispersion of his own valuable library, and blesses Divine Providence for having secured to him the uncontrolled use of the noble earl's large collection. In another passage in "the Appeal," (p. 317,) he says :—"For the first five years, during our actual civil wars, I had little list or leisure to write ; fearing to be made a History, and shifting daily for my safety. All that time I could not live *to study*, who did only study *to live*. So soon as God's goodness gave me a fixed habitation, I composed my *Land of Canaan, or Pisgah Sight*." The man who was called to endure these and similar inconveniences in the prosecution of his literary labours, must have possessed an indomitable spirit and an ardent love of learning : and his compositions, published under such great disadvantages, must not be measured by the standard of ordinary productions. While his "Church History" was in the press, he appears to have resided chiefly at Waltham Abbey, and to have been somewhat irregular in his visits to Town for the purpose of superintending its publication. In reference to this subject, he replies on one occasion to Heylin :—"I have concealed nothing herein of moment,—the blank being insignificant, and the mere mistake of the printer. Before his time, he was about to begin a new section and dedication, as appears by the *to* in the text." ("Appeal,"

p. 585.) On another occasion, this is his form of pleading :—" Here I will truly acquaint the reader with the state of this matter. The posting press, which, with the time and tide, will stay for no man, mistaking my copy complete, and not attending my coming to London that morning from Waltham, clapt it up imperfect. I must therefore, deservedly, take all the blame and shame thereof on myself, and here *in this sheet* do public penance for the same, promising amendment to the full, God willing, in the next edition." (*Idem*, p. 341.) His explanation relates to his "report of the proceedings in the Isle of Wight, between his majesty and the Long-Parliament divines;" of which report at least one entire page must have been thus carelessly omitted. His explanation also furnishes a reason why I have met with numerous discrepancies between the two copies of his "Church History" and of the "History of Cambridge" which are in my possession, though only one edition of them was printed. These variations, amounting to more than thirty, are all to be accounted for by this circumstance of Fuller's arrival in London from his country-residence, when only part of the impression of each sheet had been worked-off; and, his quick eye catching the sight of some glaring error, he has instantly stopped the press and had the proper word or phrase inserted in the remaining copies of the book. But while I urge this plea ostensibly in favour of my author, it serves virtually to bespeak the indulgence of the reader towards the editor; who, (with humility be it spoken,) beside possessing a tolerably accurate knowledge of the English language, and a degree of familiarity (through his previous course of reading) with Fuller's humour and the peculiar phraseology in which it is usually clothed, and sometimes obscured, ought, in the discharge of his assumed functions, to have in constant exercise not only all the coolness and consideration which he can command, but also much critical vigilance.\*

\* The following passage, from page 174 of the "History of the University of Cambridge," affords a fair specimen of the great consideration and vigilance necessary to be kept in perpetual requisition, with regard to the recondite wit and original phraseology of my author :—

"19. *Magnisecant Newly.*

"Dr. Thomas Nevyle, the eighth Master of this College, answering his anagram 'most heavenly,' and practising his own allusive motto, *Ne vile*

Upwards of two years have elapsed since the first four sheets of this volume passed through the press ; and other four were in a state of readiness, when I saw the announcement of a new edition of “the History of the University of Cambridge,” from the University press. Having some knowledge of the proposed editor, the late

*velis*, being, by the rules of the philosopher himself, to be accounted *μεγαλοποιεπης*, ‘as of great performances,’ for the general good,” &c.

This short sentence comprises two anagrams. One is on the surname only, *Newly* becoming NEVVYL by means of a single transposition ; the w, according to ancient usage, being resolved into vv. The other is on both the Christian and sur-name ; *most heavenly* containing all the letters needful for THOMAS NEVYLE. A third, *Ne vile velis*, is so obvious as not to be misunderstood. But, beside these, Fuller has invented an appropriate word to suit his purpose, *magnisecant* (“cutting out or contriving great matters”) being evidently intended to correspond with *Ne vile velis*, “Devise not any mean thing,” and both raised to their highest pitch by their completion in *μεγαλοποεπης*, (the exact notation of the word in the folio edition,) “as of great performances.” The whole sentiment will be, in brief : “Thomas Nevyle did not only (*newly*) ‘recently’ devise great things, but he has likewise performed them.” But some difficulty exists in the Greek epithet which is employed ; and, on the first view of it, I was persuaded that Fuller had originally written *ποιητής* as the latter part of this compound word. It would then most significantly have expressed the meaning which he has himself attached to it, “as of great performances.” On reflecting, however, that some tyro or other might entertain the supposition, from the use of the Greek term, that Nevyle was represented as having been “a great poet,” (a very common signification of the same word,) Fuller probably altered it to the form in which it stands in his folio edition. This entire paragraph, therefore, after much thought, I suffered to remain ; making only the slight addition of an *iota* to the antepenultimate of the Greek word, (according to the rather unclassical method of the word-makers *mediæ et infimæ Græcitatæ*,) to designate its immediate derivation from *μεγαλοποιέω*,—a connexion evidently pointed out by the old historian’s verbiage, and designed to be preserved.

After perusing this passage, had I ventured to alter the title of it into *Magnificent Nevyle*, and metamorphosed the proper Greek word into *μεγαλοπρεπής*,—whatever good opinion might have been previously entertained of my harmless pretensions to learning and judgment,—I should at once have forfeited every claim to public confidence and favour, by such a glaring instance of utter recklessness and palpable ignorance. For, setting aside the consideration of other topics, *μεγαλοπρεπής* itself would convey, to the mind of a competent Greek scholar, a very different idea from that which is communicated by the derivative from *ποιέω* which Fuller has here given ; the former word usually designating an eastern or passive display of grandeur, proper to the station of the person that exhibits it ; the latter, an active, energetic course of splendid deeds, such as was intended by Fuller himself, no contemptible critic, when he gave this as the plain English of it,—“being himself to be accounted *as of great performances*.”

Instances of this description might be furnished in abundance, throughout the three productions which are here presented to the public.



Rev. M. Prickett, A.M., through a common friend, I learnt from him that the "additional notes," which that lamented gentleman intended to write in elucidation of Fuller, would be cast in a mould strictly local and antiquarian. In order to distinguish the edition with which I had been entrusted from its announced competitor, and to impart a greater degree of interest to some of its pages, I thought the only method left for me, and perhaps the best I could have devised, was that of delineating the more modern intellectuality of Cambridge. I therefore determined to write copious biographical notices of the most eminent members of each College who have flourished since the days of Fuller, and to append them, in alphabetical order, to the end of those sections in which their Colleges are severally described. To delineate the living members who have shed deserved renown on this celebrated seat of learning, formed no part of my vast design. For

"Who can speak

The numerous worthies of the maiden reign?"

In carrying out this plan, I was occupied at intervals during eighteen months; and I employed upon it the same fearlessness and frankness which have always marked the expression of my opinions. But I soon discovered, that these records, though individually brief, and sufficiently graphic to designate each man of celebrity, increased in quantity, till at length my yet imperfect collection of sketches amounted to such a mass as greatly exceeded the limits which I had prescribed to myself. I was on this account induced to abandon the undertaking; but I look forward with hope to a more advanced period in my life, when my judgment shall have become more matured, and my prepossessions, if not so strong, may at least not be so strongly expressed; and when, if still favoured by Heaven with the possession of vigorous faculties, I may be inclined to finish a series of original literary sketches concerning those learned Cambridge-men who have rendered themselves famous at any time during the last two centuries. This paragraph will, I trust, be favourably received as a needful apology for the delay which has occurred in the publication of the present volume.

JAMES NICHOLS.

# CONTENTS.

---

## HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

### SECTION I. A. D. 1066—1265.

**THE** low condition of Cambridge at the Conquest—Cambridge Castle built by king William—Henry Beauclerk bred in Cambridge; probably a benefactor to the University—Mischievous Montgomery—Picot's foundation in St. Giles's parish—The injurious original of impropriations—Cambridge first made a corporation—The original of Midsummer Fair—The first coming of Jews to Cambridge—Cambridge restored to learning by the abbot of Crowland. A grain of seed soon grown a tree. The time of this author's writing—An apparent injury offered to Cambridge. She is vindicated from such as traduce her—Pain Peverel founds Barnwell Priory—Alphred of Beverley, student in Cambridge—Unwonder me this wonder—The first earl of Cambridge—David king of Scots, earl of Cambridge—Observations collected from this grant—Nigellus's foundation in Cambridge. Roger of Hereford, student in Cambridge—A merciless fire. Oxford deserted, and partly removed to Cambridge—John of St. Omer's, a poet, bred in Cambridge. Joceline Brakeland, a historian therein—The University in a sad condition; which still continueth—Eels sent from Cambridge to Oxford. A gaol made of a Jew's house. Privileges confirmed to Cambridge—Paris students invited over into England—Counterfeit scholars do much mischief. The sheriff commanded to suppress these malignants—The unconscionableness of the townsmen regulated by the king's letters—The original of taxers—The ill effects of tournaments; forbidden within five miles of Cambridge. Mothers of misrule. A sad chance—Foul work in Lent—The first founding of Peter-House—Brawls and bickerings betwixt southern and northern scholars. The northern men worsted. The matter referred to the judges itinerant; remitted to the former commissioners—Northampton University begun, and dissolved—Mr. Brian Twyne justly condemned, for injecting causeless suspicions—His needless cavil confuted—Quick eyes to find a fault where none is. Answer this dilemma. The Tower Records clear the cavil—A needless question declined. Why Oxford more prejudiced than Cambridge by Northampton University. Pages 1—29.

### SECTION II. A. D. 1265—1344.

**The** king's intentions to fortify Cambridge. Ditch made; walls meant. Cambridge plundered on the king's departure—Necton, first Car-



melite doctor in divinity. Why Carmelites at first would not commence. Necton first breaks the ice, and others follow in his track—Oxford's antiquary justly taxed. Petrus Blæsenſis to be believed before Brian Twyne—Tournaments again forbidden—Prince Edward ordereth an agreement between the scholars and townsmen—No University as yet in Scotland and Ireland—Cambridge receives all countries—A composition betwixt the University of Cambridge and the archdeacon of Ely—Observations: University equivocal. The officers thereof—Query: what meant by "*Magister Glomeræ?*"—The bishop accused of presumption herein—Some over-harsh in their censures. Moderation is best—The ancient Hostels in Cambridge—Inns less than Hostels—Two hundred Halls said to be in Oxford. Magnitude supplies multitude—The benefit and use of Hostels. A catalogue of learned Cambridge Hostellers—Ancient religious houses in Cambridge—Frequent contests betwixt Friars and University-men—A list of learned Friars, writers—The first endowing of Peter-House. Zoars may grow great in time—A general rule about our Catalogue of Benefactors—*Cautela non nocet*—Repetition of bishops, why necessary—A commendable custom of this College—The eldest English-endowed College. Exception to the contrary answered. The truth unpartially stated—Three places for the Petreans' devotions. [Succession of Chancellors. Brawl betwixt University-men and Friars. Bull of pope John XXI. to the University]—A necessary caution. *Studium* and *Universitas* the same in effect—A facile mistake—Michael-House founded by Herveus Stanton—University Hall built by Richard Badew. Rebuilt (after it was burnt) by Elizabeth countess of Clare, and named Clare Hall—Richard III. a (seeming) Benefactor to Clare Hall. This Hall long chapel-less. Solere the same with Clare Hall—The Hall lately re-edified—King Edward foundeth King's Hall—Three eminences of this Hall. *Tempora mutantur*. The happiness of this Hall—Privileges granted by king Edward III. to the University—A German marquess made earl of Cambridge, A. D. 1340; and a Belgian earl, A. D. 1342—Mary de Saint Paul founds Pembroke Hall, and Denny Abbey—Two remarkable pieces of plate. An invidious elogy of this Hall. Robert de Thorp Lord Chancellor—A Greek and grateful scholar. Benefactors in losing their lives. Pages 30—67.

### SECTION III. A. D. 1344—1396.

The two Cambridge guilds united—*Corpus Christi*, or Bene't College built. Henry duke of Lancaster the honorary founder. Stow's mistake, with the ground thereof—The superstitious procession on *Corpus-Christi* day endeth in a feast at Bene't College. The canopy ominously fired—The townsmen quarrel for their dinner: are cast by the king's commissioners—Duchess of Norfolk builds their buttresses—The benefaction of Matthew Parker—A great favourer of Norfolk-men—Dr. Sowde and Dr. Copcot. The College arms why altered. Where I had my instructions of this College—A bank and a lank of charity. William Bateman foundeth Trinity Hall. The Masters' catalogue might be amended—A pious design. A bitter retort—A dispensation for increase of commons. The exceeding

cheapness of all commodities—Causes of dearness. Nor full, nor fasting—Convenient diet needful for students—Gonville-Hall founded. Archbishop Ufford a commoner therein. This Hall transplanted—Two noble Students. Fishwick's Hostel given to this Hall—Papal indulgences. Masters, Benefactors, &c. of Gonville Hall. The earl of Cambridge—A contest about choosing of Chancellor—Discords betwixt Dominicans and Carmelites. The Dominican chargeth. The Carmelite receiveth the charge, and conquereth—Chaucer a Cambridge student—A rebellious riot of the townsmen of Cambridge. University monuments martyred—The townsmen called to a legal account. Their pitiful plea—Privileges conferred on the University. *Focalia* prized by the Chancellor—An order that no scholar is to be admitted under eighteen years of age. The Franciscans oppose this order. The issue uncertain. [Beneficed men licensed by the pope as Non-residents]—A parliament kept at Cambridge—Canterbury misprinted for Cambridge in the statute-book. The excellent statutes of Cambridge parliament against wandering Scholars—A strange miracle. Not like those in the Scripture. A strange plague in Cambridge. The like after was at Oxford—John Bromiard, a fierce anti-Wicklivist. Both best by turns. Statute against fugitive Friars—The first person of honour Chancellor of Cambridge. Cambridge's Chancellor no longer confirmed by Ely's bishop. Pages 68—89.

## SECTION IV. A.D. 1400—1436.

The large privilege of Cambridge for printing, much improved therein—The University visited by the archbishop of Canterbury. The archbishop's mandate to the Chancellor. Another to every College. A mistake in the printed date—The occasion of this visitation. The archbishop comes in pomp to Cambridge. All the scholars appear before him. The Chancellor first examined. Several chests in Cambridge, with their donors—Several Colleges visited by the archbishop's Commissioners. Why Trinity Hall first visited. The plea of the guardian thereof; summoning none to appear out of the Province of Canterbury. An observation—Clare Hall visited, and *Corpus Christi* College, and the White Canons—A day of non-term with the visitors. Radegund nuns visited. Their visitation ended—Query, about omissions of the Commissioners. Hostels why not visited. Reformation remitted to the archbishop's leisure—Query: what now became of Cambridge's ancient exemptions? A probable conjecture—Oxford Argentine challengeth all Cambridge. An account of his achievements, (after prose,) now in verse—The Chancellor sent to Rome—The original of Vice-Chancellors. Thomas Markant's excellent book, lost and found, lost and found, lost—Difference betwixt the University and Londoners. The original of Sturbridge-fair. Sale of the privileges thereof seasonably prevented—A beneficial grant to University-men, refused by their own folly; but, on second thoughts, accepted—Differences betwixt the bishop of Ely and the University, remitted by the pope to the prior of Barnwell. The pope giveth his sentence for Cambridge's exemption—A constant tenure of princely earls—The University's money embezzled. Never restored to the same degree. Vehement suspicion of corruption. Pages 90—104.

## SECTION V. A. D. 1436—1505.

Cambridge fens endeavoured to be drained. All in vain. Arguments *pro* and *con* fen-draining—Since effected to admiration. *Labor improbus omnia vincit*. Cambridge why jealous herein; never pleased. Deep philosophy. A real refutation. Cambridge air bettered—King Henry foundeth a small College, and William Bingham another. Both united and enlarged into King's College. The admirable chapel—A catalogue of King's College Worthies—Why so few have been Benefactors to this House. The instrumental advancers of so worthy a work. Dr. Sommerset said to be ungratefully used by Cambridge—King Edward IV. a malefactor to this College—An old debt well paid. The arms of King's College—A strange speech (pretended) of king Henry VI.; considering then Cambridge equal with Oxford in number of Colleges—The speech avouched by no historian. A memorable tradition, and a necessary conclusion—The original of the Schools in Cambridge. The old Schools a mean structure. The several founders of the modern Schools—Cambridge library augmented with many precious books—Queen's College founded by queen Margaret. The inscription on the first stone. Queen Elizabeth finished what queen Margaret began—Some truth in much talk. Give what is thine own. Two coats for one body. A benefactor-general to learning. An ingenious and useful design—Erasmus, a Student in Queen's College—The founding of Catherine Hall—Properly a pretty Hall—The foundation of Jesus College. The incontinence of Saint Radegund's nuns. John Major's testimony hereof—The character of bishop Alcock. Jesus College the bishop of Ely's House—First Chancellor for life—Erasmus studieth in Queen's College; was first Greek- then Divinity-professor. No mercenary writers in Cambridge. Cambridge within few years much improved in learning—Erasmus's judgment of Cambridge and Oxford. A second, a third, verdict of the same. His character of Cambridge townsmen. Pages 105—133.

## SECTION VI. A. D. 1505—1535.

King Henry comes to Cambridge—The building of St. Mary's—The foundation of Christ's College. The fair endowments thereof. A lady of pity—John Major, a Student in Christ's College—John Leland, Fellow therein—Reformation of augmentation—The worthies of this College—Caution general—The death of the lady Margaret. The carefulness of her executors—The site of St. John's College. Crowded with Students—A rape offered on the Muses—An infant rebellion, seasonably crushed—A rake-hell to be chosen before a dunce. The first [and] second reasons. An ingenuous Master well met with an ingenuous Fellow. Well spoken, well taken—Confess, and be forgiven—Peter de Valence excommunicated. Many years after, he confesseth his fault—Monks' turned into Buckingham College—A pair of learned writers—The untimely death of the duke of Buckingham—Crook's character—A catalogue of Cambridge Orators.

—Bilney's scruple in conscience—Two opposite parties, for and against superstition—Latimer converted by Bilney. [Cranmer ejected from his fellowship for being married.] Crook, out-bought, departeth to Oxford—The privilege of the University—Latimer's sermon of cards—A suspected (if not a false) report—[Cranmer retires to Waltham on account of the plague. Of which Mr. Stafford dies] Mr. Stafford possibly Margaret Professor—Bennet, a martyr of Cambridge—A doughty pair of challengers, well worsted for their pains. They return with shame. The report qualified. A causeless jeer. More modesty argues not less learning—[The University's renunciation of the pope's supremacy]—The course of the Scholars' studies altered for the better—The Lord Cromwell chosen Chancellor, in the place of bishop Fisher. The great good he did the University—Craiford's character—The first general visitation of Cambridge, *jure Regio*. The injunctions to the University of Dr. Legh, Chancellor, Cromwell's surrogate—King Henry's injunctions to the University of Cambridge—The submission of the Master and Fellows of Gonville Hall to the king's injunctions—University records delivered to the lord Cromwell—No more doctors of Canon Law; which is annexed to Civil. Pages 133—167.

## SECTION VII. A. D. 1536—1559.

A combination against Dr. Metcalfe. Great deserts soon forgotten. Guilt haunted with justice—Cambridge records re-delivered unto them. Query. Whether the popes' bulls were in specie restored—Gardiner made Chancellor. Contention about pronouncing of Greek. The champions for the new mode. An inartificial argument—The lord Audley builds Maudlin College. The arms thereof—An ill neighbour to a studious College. A monarch Master—A good proffer. Was it wisely refused?—Charitable Mr. Palmer. Learning runs low—Trinity College founded by king Henry VIII.—A dutiful daughter—*Magnisecant* Newly—Eminent men in all professions, with many more living—King's Professors founded. Catalogues of them very imperfect—The lord Protector made Chancellor. The insolencies of the townsmen. Ascham's letters procure friends to the University—A proffer of the Protector's to unite Clare and Trinity Hall; blasted by bishop Gardiner—An extraordinary act before the king's commissioners—Northumberland made Chancellor—Bucer and Fagius called to Cambridge, made Professors there. The death of Fagius. Tremellius, Hebrew Professor in Cambridge—Henry and Charles Brandon die of the sweating-sickness—Several dates of Bucer's death—A loud lie of a lewd Jesuit—Queen Mary secretly passeth into Suffolk—Dr. Sandys preacheth before the duke of Northumberland. The duke's retrograde motion. Read, and wonder at human uncertainty. The hard usage of Dr. Sandys—Masters placed and displaced—Dr. Caius foundeth Caius College; giveth it good land, and good building, good statutes, a new name, and hieroglyphical arms. No violent Papist—A numerous nursery of eminent physicians—Cardinal Pole Chancellor both of Cambridge and Oxford. His visitation of Cambridge—Cambridge visited by queen Elizabeth's commissioners. Pages 168—194.

## SECTION VIII. A. D. 1564—1618.

Queen Elizabeth comes to Cambridge. Her oration to the University. Noblemen made Masters of Arts—The first cause of Mr. Cartwright's discontentment. The same disavowed by his followers—The factions in Trinity College. Whitgift and Cartwright clash in the Schools—Whitgift's commencing Doctor. Whitgift summons Cartwright, who gives in a list of his opinions—Dr. Baker, Provost of King's College, flies for religion. Roger Goade chosen in his place. [Number of Students in the University]—Rent-corn first reserved to Colleges, by the procurement of Sir T. Smith. Great profit thereby—A contest betwixt Dr. Baro and Mr. Chadderton—Emmanuel College founded by Sir Walter Mildmay, who causelessly fell into the queen's displeasure. His answer to queen Elizabeth—Dr. Holdsworth refuseth a bishopric. A good meditation of a dying saint. Two grand benefactors. The living omitted—The last Vice-Chancellor then, but Fellow of the House—An unfaithful Register—Barrett summoned before the consistory. His solemn recantation—The sickness and death of Dr. Whitaker. His sad and solemn funeral. Overall succeeds him in the Professor's place—Dr. Baro quits his Professor's place. Different judgments about his departure—The first foundation of Sidney-Sussex College. The spite of *Index Expurgatorius*. The College-mortmain how procured—A little babe (thank God and good nurses!) well batted—Sir Francis Clark deservedly accounted a by-founder. To whom sir John Brereton not much inferior. A chapel added after some years. A child's prayer for his mother—Club-law acted in Clare-Hall. Complained of by the townsmen to the council-table. How declined—Robert earl of Essex made Chancellor. Sir Robert Cecil chosen Chancellor—King James's matchless entertainment at Hinchinbrook; where the Doctors of Cambridge wait on his majesty—The death of Mr. Perkins—Recusants' presentations given to the Universities. The statute, how frequently frustrated by Recusants. Burgesses granted the Universities—The death and high epitaph of Dr. Playfere—Master Amese troubled about his sermon in St. Mary's, against all playing at cards and dice. He leaveth the College—Mr. Sympton's sermon and recantation—The first and last knight mayor of Cambridge. Pages 195—224.

## SECTION IX. A. D. 1618—1643.

Henry Howard Chancellor of Cambridge. Sometimes it hits. His learned book—The death of Dr. Butler—The marquess of Hamilton made earl of Cambridge. Mr. Preston prosecuted by the commissary; and how escaping. The lord Mainard foundeth a Logic-Professor. The Scholars' number—A tough canvass for Trinity-lecture. Dr. Preston carries it clear. King James's last coming to Cambridge—The death of Mr. Andrew Downes. Mr. Creighton chosen his successor. The duke of Buckingham elected Chancellor. The earl of Holland made Chancellor—The lord Brooke founded an History-Professor. Dr. Dorislaus accused—Country penury,

Cambridge plenty. The candle-suit with the townsmen. The plague in Cambridge. Good counsel. King Charles and queen Mary come to Cambridge—Master Adams founds an Arabic Professorship. A smart passage in a sermon. Mr. Bernard gives distaste with his preaching. Convented in the High Commission, refuseth to recant, and dieth—Organs erected in chapels—College-plate sent to the king. The act aggravated, and excused. Three Doctors imprisoned in the Tower, and the Vice-Chancellor in Ely-House—The Heads deny the Parliament money. The death of Dr. Ward—The oath of discovery tendered, and refused. Mr. Ash disavoweth any such oath—The Covenant generally tendered, and refused—Offence taken at bishop Brownrigg's sermon. Ejectment of Masters, Fellows, and Scholars from Queen's College. What became of so many ejected Fellows. The Chaplains' plea for themselves.—Great alteration in Heads of Houses—The sad effects of war. Townsmen tax Scholars—Moderate men's judgment. St. Andrew's Church repaired—The author's just apology. A witty homonymous answer. A prayer—Additional note by the Editor, on the introduction of Mathematics into the University. Pages 225—252.

---

## THE HISTORY OF WALTHAM-ABBEY.

### I.

#### INTRODUCTION.

The author's design—Waltham, why so named. The situation thereof. Excused from bad air. First founded by Tovy. Falls back to the crown. Bestowed on earl Harold—The model of the modern church. Mortality triumphant—A dean and canons founded at Waltham. Seventeen manors confirmed to them by the Confessor—Harold crowned, killed, and buried at Waltham. Deforming Reformers. Pages 253—259.

### II.

#### THE RE-FOUNDATION OF WALTHAM-ABBEY BY HENRY II.

Waltham canons in a sad condition. The industry of Robert Fuller, last abbot of Waltham—Queen Maud gives Waltham Monks a mill: queen Adelisia, the tithes. King Stephen's bounty—King Henry dissolves the dean and canons at Waltham. Augustinians substituted in their room. Rome-land in Waltham. Fitz-Aucher settled at Copt-Hall. Hugh Neville a bountiful benefactor—[King Henry III. bestows a market and a fair.] Waltham market—Broils betwixt the abbot and the townsmen about commons. The sturdiness of the townsmen. The most guilty first accuse. The abbot comes off conqueror—The suit betwixt the abbot of Waltham and the lord of Chesthunt. A like not the same. The suit determined. Accessions

to lengthen the cause—Chesthunt Nunnery founded. Copt-Hall passed to king Henry VIII. Pages 259—266.

### III.

THE EXTRACTION, CHARTER, DEATH, AND ISSUE OF SIR ANTHONY DENNY, ON WHOM KING HENRY VIII. BESTOWED WALTHAM-ABBAY.

A lease of Waltham-Abbey given to sir Anthony Denny. John Denny, the great soldier in France. Edmond Denny, baron of the Exchequer. —Anthony Denny's high commendations. His epitaph made by the lord Howard. His issue by Dame Joan his wife. Pages 266—268.

### IV.

THE CONDITION OF WALTHAM-CHURCH FROM THE DISSOLUTION OF THE ABBEY UNTIL THE DEATH OF KING HENRY VIII.

Anno 1542, the thirty-fourth of Henry VIII.—1543, the thirty-fifth of Henry VIII.—1544, the thirty-sixth of Henry VIII.—1546, the thirty-eighth of Henry VIII. Pages 268—271.

### V.

THE STATE OF WALTHAM-CHURCH DURING THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD VI.

Anno 1549, the third of Edward VI.—1551, the fifth of Edward VI. Pages 271, 272.

### VI.

CHURCH-ALTERATIONS IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN MARY.

Anno 1554, *Mariæ primo*—1556, *Mariæ tertio*. Pages 272—275.

### VII.

THE CONDITION OF THE CHURCH FROM THE BEGINNING OF QUEEN ELIZABETH TO THIS DAY.

Anno 1558, *Elizabethæ primo*—1562, *Elizabethæ quinto*—1563, *Elizabethæ sexto*—High time to knock off. James earl of Carlisle present owner of Waltham—Nicholas the most eminent abbot of Waltham. John de Waltham. Roger Waltham a learned writer—Hugh Neville buried in Waltham; and also Robert Passellew—A heap of difficulties cast together. Queries on queries—King Charles's last coming to Waltham. Conditionally granteth the repairing of the church; but it miscarrieth. Pages 275—280.

# THE APPEAL OF INJURED INNOCENCE.

## PART I.

### INTRODUCTION.

CONTAINING FULLER'S INTRODUCTION, FOURTEEN CHAPTERS: HIS ANSWER TO DR. HEYLIN'S TITLE-PAGE TO THE "GENERAL PREFACE," TO THE "NECESSARY INTRODUCTION," AND TO "THE ANIMADVERSIONS ON BOOK I. OF THE CHURCH-HISTORY OF BRITAIN."

### CHAPTER I.

That it is impossible for the pen of any historians, writing in (as ours) a divided age, to please all parties, and how easy it is to cavil at any author. Pages 281—285.

### CHAPTER II.

Why the author desired and hoped never to come under the pen of the Animadvertor in a controversial difference. Pages 285—287.

### CHAPTER III.

That, after serious debate, the author found himself necessitated to make this "Appeal" in his own just vindication. Pages 287, 288.

### CHAPTER IV.

THE AUTHOR'S FIRST GENERAL ANSWER,

Taken from his title-page, and word "endeavoured." Pages 288, 289.

### CHAPTER V.

THE SECOND GENERAL ANSWER.

That many, especially memory-mistakes, and pen-slips, must be expected in a great volume. Page 290.

### CHAPTER VI.

THE THIRD GENERAL ANSWER.

That in entire stories of impregnable truth, it is facile for one to cavil with some colour at dismembered passages therein. Page 291.

### CHAPTER VII.

THE FOURTH GENERAL ANSWER.

That favour, of course, is indulged to the first (as least perfect) edition of books. Pages 292, 293.

### CHAPTER VIII.

THE FIFTH GENERAL ANSWER.

That it is no shame for any man to confess, (when convinced thereof,) and amend, an error in his judgment. Pages 293—295.



## CHAPTER IX.

## THE SIXTH GENERAL ANSWER.

That prelat mislakes, in defiance of all care, will escape in the best-corrected book. Pages 295, 296.

## CHAPTER X.

## THE SEVENTH AND LAST GENERAL ANSWER.

That an author, charging his margin with his author, is thereby himself discharged. Pages 296, 297.

## CHAPTER XI.

That many of the Animadvertor's notes are only additional, not opposite, to what I have written; and that all things omitted in an history are not defects. Pages 297, 298.

## CHAPTER XII.

That the author designed unto himself no party-pleasing in writing his Church-History. Pages 299, 300.

## CHAPTER XIII.

What good the Animadvertor might, but would not, do; and what good, by God's goodness, he herein hath done unto the author. Pages 300, 301.

## CHAPTER XIV.

That the author is unjustly charged by the Animadvertor for being agreeable to the times; and how far forth such agreeableness is consistent with Christian prudence. Pages 301—305.

## ANSWER TO HEYLIN'S GENERAL PREFACE AND NECESSARY INTRODUCTION.

Heylin's Animadversions on the following topics, and Fuller's Answer to them:—"The Holy State." Preface to the "Church-History." Titles, dedicatory-epistles, and intermediate inscriptions, heraldry, blazons of arms, and descents of noble families—Battle-abbey roll—Hereditary chamberlain of England. Richard Plantagenet—Poetry, old popish legends, and merry tales. Excursions about the antiquity of Cambridge. Too much of civil history, and too little of ecclesiastical. Omission of some synods and convocations, of popish heterodoxies and superstitions, and of the defences made by Bancroft, Bilson, &c.—The will of Henry VIII. and the coronation of Charles I. Murdering of kings. Consent of the people. The Church deprived of her authority. Wickliffe. Presbyterianism. Treaty at the Isle of Wight. Consecration of churches and chapels. Removal of archi-episcopal see from London to Canterbury. Cure of the king's-evil. Errata. Pages 305—351.

## BOOK I.—NUMBERS 1—28.

Condition of the Britons before the introduction of Christianity. Their gods. Diana. Derivation of London. The Druids—The Roman conquest—Metaphrastes. Fuller, of Hammersmith. Whether St.

Peter, or Joseph of Arimathea, planted the gospel in England. Glastonbury-thorn—King Lucius and pope Eleutherius. Flamens and arch-flamens. Geoffrey of Monmouth, Mason *De Ministerio Anglicano*—Amphibalus. Derivation of Lichfield. Cern, in Dorsetshire. Constantius Chlorus. The nine worthies. Pages 352—383.

---

## PART II.

CONTAINING ANSWERS TO HEYLIN'S ANIMADVERSIONS ON BOOKS  
II.—X. OF THE CHURCH-HISTORY.

### BOOK II.—NUMBERS 29—59.

Conversion of the Saxons. Their idols, Woden, Thur, &c.—Augustine the reputed apostle of the English. Transfer of the archi-episcopal see from London to Canterbury. Baptism in the river Swale, in Yorkshire. Cross in Baptism—Derivation of the Italian, Spanish, and French languages. The Hebrew and the Welsh original languages—Difference between “catholic” and “Roman catholic.”—Crekelade and Lechlade. Derivation of Durham, and of Tyburn. Alba. Cimbria Chersonesus—Doctors and chancellors, recent dignitaries—Cambridgeshire-men to lead the van in all battles. Edward the Confessor. Origin of the Common Law—Cure of the king's evil. Form of the service, with the collect—Title of Harold to the crown of England. Norman Conquest. Pages 384—416.

### BOOK III.—NUMBERS 60—78.

Power of the canon-law after the Norman Conquest—Submission of the clergy to Henry VIII. Their petition, and the answer to it. Christian antiquity of St. David's—St. Stephen's chapel, Westminster. Geoffrey Plantagenet. King John's unchristian embassy to the king of Morocco—The town-house of the bishops of Rochester, of Lincoln, and of Bangor—Royalists—Magna Charta, and the prosperity of those kings who were strict in their observance of its stipulations—Banishment of the Jews out of France and England—Hugh Spencer earl of Winchester, and earl of Gloucester—The lord Chancellor most commonly a bishop—Institution of the Order of the Garter. Knights, chancellor, and register of the order. The knights' habiliments. Canons of Windsor—Pedigree of the Montague family. Pages 417—433.

### BOOK IV.—NUMBERS 79—100.

The doctrines of Wickliffe. False Report of his reconciliation to the church of Rome. Marc Antony De Dominis—Chaucer's, Spencer's, and Drayton's tombs—Roger Mortimer, earl of March—Bishops are barons and peers of the realm. Whether the king, the parliament, or the clergy directed the proceedings of the ecclesiastical court in cases of heresy. Henry VII. born at Pembroke. His son broke down the partition-wall between England and Wales—Fuller's residence at Oxford while Charles I. held his court there—Charles V. Aux in Guienne. Johannes de Voragine a good author—Earls of Cambridge

—Fuller's power of memory. Wickham and Wainfleet. King's College, Cambridge—Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, contrasted with Henry of Bolingbroke, duke of Lancaster and Hereford—The doctrine of murdering deposed and captive princes, repudiated by Fuller—Sir William Stanley at the battle of Bosworth-field. Pages 434—454.

#### BOOK V.—NUMBERS 101—124.

Dr. Newlen—Lilly's Grammar enjoined by Henry VIII. to be used in all grammar-schools. The scholarship of Henry VIII.—Whitehall. Cardinal Wolsey. Christ-College, Oxford—Margaret duchess of Alençon—Wolsey holds the archbishopric of York in *commendam* with the rich bishopric of Winchester till his death—The puritan party will not grant that queen Elizabeth perfected the Reformation—Marriage of Henry VIII. with Anne Boleyn—The doctrines held by Wickliffe, the ore of Protestantism—Suppression of the stews in London—Henry Fitzroy, natural son of Henry VIII.—The authority of the church, and whether its proceedings are subject to the power of parliaments. Statute of premunire. Submission of the clergy to Henry VIII. Subsidy of the clergy to queen Elizabeth—Dr. Pilkington, bishop of Durham, and queen Elizabeth. Pages 454—476.

#### BOOK VI.—NUMBERS 125—134.

Cistercian monks from Cisteaux—St. George of Cappadocia—The Dominicans and the Jesuits, the rigid Lutherans and the Melanchthonians, the peremptory Calvinists and the Remonstrants, severally at issue with each other on the points of predestination, free-will, &c.—Abbeys consumed by lightning—The northern rebellion under Aske and lord Darcy, on account of the suppression of monasteries—Foundation of six bishoprics—Comparison between the monks and nuns, thrust out of house and home, and the sequestered protestant clergy of the English church. The fifth part of each benefice allowed to each of the sequestered clergy, but scarcely ever obtained—Westminster church is changed by queen Mary from a late-made cathedral to an abbey—Statute for the suppression of religious Orders—The Oratorians the latest of all the Orders in the Romish Church. Pages 476—485.

#### BOOK VII.—NUMBERS 135—142.

The injunctions of Edward VI. respecting labouring in the time of harvest, on holy days, and Sundays—First edition of the Liturgy—Nonconformists—Sternhold and Hopkins's metrical translation of the Psalms, allowed by authority, in most parish-churches thrust out the *Te Deum*, *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, and *Nunc dimittis*—Examples to deter subjects from marrying the widows of their sovereigns—The origin of king Edward's forty-six articles of religion and catechism. Pages 485—491.

#### BOOK VIII.—NUMBERS 143—150.

Loyalty of the commons on queen Mary's accession. Statute of succession—The convocation commonly reputed a part of parliament—Aristotle's opinion respecting the fittest age for marriage—The protestant exiles at Frankfort omit some ceremonies in the public service and in the

administration of the sacraments—Dr. Wright, bishop of Lichfield, and Dr. Skinner, bishop of Oxford, both of Trinity College in Oxford. The famous John Selden and William Chillingworth also members of that College. Dr. Francis Cheynel—The loss of Calais. Pages 491—496.

BOOK IX.—NUMBERS 151—193.

**Non-permission of idolatry.** Some members of the Romish church idolaters. Idolatry to be suppressed only by a lawful authority. The conduct of the citizens of Geneva, and the protestants in the Low Countries, respecting the extirpation of popish images—Activity of the parliament 1 Elizabeth—The spire of St. Paul's steeple consumed by fire, and repaired by the citizens of London—Reason why archbishop Cranmer's children were by act of parliament restored in blood—Composition of the thirty-nine articles of religion. Christ's local descent into hell maintained by the English church. Concerning the power of the church "to decree rites and ceremonies and authority in controversies of the faith," contained in the twentieth article, as published in 1563, which clause was retained by archbishop Laud, but left out in the puritanic editions of 1571 and 1612—Enactments of 13 Elizabeth respecting the articles—Character of the homilies—Origin of the name of puritans—Covetous conformists—Ministerial prophesyings patronized by archbishop Grindal: king James's opinion concerning them—Two acts of parliament 23 Elizabeth against the papists and puritans—The court of Marches—Death of archbishop Grindal—Subscription to certain articles enforced—The oath *ex officio* and the High-Commission court censured—Scurrilous pamphlets of Throgmorton, Penry, and Fenner—How far an author is accountable for those whom he quotes—The vileness of Hacket—The presbyterian ordination of Travers, condemned by Heylin, allowed by Fuller—The sabbatarian controversy. Origin of the Lambeth articles on predestination, grace, &c. Calvinism imported into England by some of the English protestant exiles in the reign of queen Mary. Dr. Peter Baro. Dr. Whitaker—The polemic productions of Bilson, Cosin, Bancroft, and Hooker. The execution of Copping, Thacker, Barrow, Greenwood, and Penry. Imprisonment of Udal, Billot, Studley, and Bouler. Stillness of the nonconformists—Abbot Feckenham's message to queen Elizabeth. Pages 497—526.

BOOK X.—NUMBERS 194—221.

**Watson's silly treason.** Sir Griffith Markham one of his accomplices. An inquiry concerning the other conspirators. The millenary petition—Bishop Barlow's publication of the Hampton-Court conference. Dr. King, bishop of London—Statute to prevent final alienation of churchland—The remissness of some prelates in promoting the erection of Chelsea college—Enumeration of some famous men of the name of Fuller—The earl of Dunbar's mode of becoming possessed of Norham-castle—The Genevian notes to the Bible condemned by king James, as partial, untrue, seditious, &c. Specimens of them—Bishop Harsnet's sermon at court in 1609, on "Render to Cæsar," &c.—Bishop Neile's speech in the house of lords—Selden's book on tithes. Its effects rendered nugatory. Answers to it. Copy of Selden's

submission and acknowledgment before the High-Commission court—Description of Dr. Mocket's collection of Latin treatises on the doctrines and discipline of the church of England. He omits the first clause of the twentieth article of the church. His book condemned to be burnt—Description of the Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants in the Low Countries—The discipline of the church of England virtually condemned by the Synod of Dort—Dr. Williams promoted to the office of Lord Chancellor. This office in former ages occupied by the dignitaries of the church—Marc Antony De Dominis, archbishop of Spalato. His extreme cupidity. He is seduced by the Romish party, and ruined—The Spanish match opposed by the puritans. Reasons alleged by Heylin as the grounds of this opposition. Pages 526—552.

---

### PART III.

CONTAINING FULLER'S ANSWER TO HEYLIN'S ANIMADVERSIONS ON  
BOOK XI. OF THE CHURCH-HISTORY OF BRITAIN.

#### BOOK XI.—NUMBERS 222—337.

The funeral of king James—Remarks on Dr. Preston, and his brief connexion with the duke of Buckingham—King Charles's marriage with Henrietta Maria of France. Provision for her popish chaplains—Coronation of king Charles: bishop Williams not present on that occasion. The precedence of various officers of state. The consent or good-liking of the people asked at the coronation. Protestation of several noblemen to spill their blood in defence of the crown; forgotten by many of them in the subsequent civil war—Contrast between bishop Andrews and archbishop Laud in regard to ceremonies—Commission for suspending archbishop Abbot from the exercise of his official duties. The legislative authority of foreign councils not binding on Englishmen. Drs. Williams, Carew, and Laud refuse to receive episcopal consecration from archbishop Abbot, who was afterwards received into favour at court—Account of the association of feoffees for the purchase of impropriations. The abuses of the system, and its suppression—"Declaration about Sports" ordered by authority to be read in every parish-church. The two Judges of Assize for the western circuit make a severe order for the suppression of wakes and revels in the county of Somerset, enjoining the constables to deliver a copy to the minister of every parish, who was to read it in the church every year. This abuse of the Lord's-day generally reputed a principal cause of God's anger poured out on the nation during the civil war—Disputes concerning the position of the communion-table. Fuller to be appointed moderator in this disputation—Excellent character of bishop Juxon. Deering's character of archbishop Laud—Critique on Prynne's early writings. His moderation towards the close of life—Archbishop Williams's conduct and imprisonment. Motion for his degradation. Circumstances attending the degradation of Dr. Marmaduke Middleton, bishop of St. David's.

**Conduct of Mr. Osbaldeston**—The introduction of the Liturgy the evident cause of the troubles in Scotland. Metaphysical distribution of causes. The refusal of a barony to Leslie one of the chief causes of the Scotch insurrection. Archbishop Laud and Dr. Cosin generally but improperly blamed by the Scots on this account. The whole transaction had the approval and co-operation of the Scotch bishops. The ease with which, by God's blessing, the Scotch rebellion might have been at first suppressed. No assurance-office for the success of battles—A convocation of the clergy called in 1640: Fuller appointed one of the clerks. His meekness under the reproaches of Heylin. The sittings of the convocation prolonged by the king's commission, *durante beneplacito*. Drs. Brownrigg, Hacket, and others protested against the further continuance of the convocation. The number of its members. An old convocation converted into a new synod. The remarks of lord George Digby and sir Edward Deering. Synods and convocations nearly synonymous. A committee appointed to deliberate about a canon for uniformity in rites and ceremonies. The taking of the *et cetera* oath much pressed, even before the proper time, by some bishops. Mr. Maynard's speech against the canons. Act of 51 Edward III.—The power of the High-Commission court and of the bishops' courts destroyed—Drs. Pocklington and Bray the first who felt the displeasure of the Long Parliament, at the instigation of bishop Williams—Impeachment and imprisonment of Dr. Wren—A Protestation ordered to be generally taken throughout the kingdom—Lord Brooke's book against bishops, in respect of their low parentage and unsuitable studies—The Protestation subscribed by twelve of the bishops, who are impeached of high-treason, and committed to the Tower—The earl of Bath—Origin of the words "Malignant" and "Roundhead"—Bishop Wren detained in the Tower after the release of his episcopal brethren—Conduct of archbishop Williams—The English bishops have their vote in parliament as "a third estate;" and not as temporal barons—Some objections to their "third-estateship"—The calling together of the "assembly of divines" not to be ascribed to the vacation of the convocation—Fanciful mode of condemning the "solemn league and covenant"—White's "First Century"—Fuller's vindication of his own integrity in his account of the episcopal clergy—The principal Independents did not leave England on account of debt, but from truly conscientious motives—Christopher Love's intemperate conduct at the treaty at Uxbridge—Commendation of archbishop Laud's "Diary." Prynne's baseness in his extracts from it, and innuendoes concerning them. Refutation of Laud's inclination to popery. Two anecdotes on the subject. His endeavours to promote concord among Christians. The Jesuits and puritans hindered this proposed concord. The efforts of the archbishop of Spalato and Franciscus de Sanctâ Clarâ. Archbishop Laud's defects and excellencies enumerated by Fuller—The attachment of the English nation to the Liturgy not eradicated by ordinances of parliament. Even Stephen Marshall wished his daughter to be married according to the form prescribed in the "Common Prayer-Book," and instantly paid down five pounds, the fine imposed for using any other form than that of the "Directory." A similar fine paid by Mr. Knightly of Fawsley—Delegates from the

University of Oxford plead their privileges in vain before parliament, as well as a salvo in one of the articles concerning the surrendry of that city—Proceedings of the parliamentary visitors at Cambridge. Oath of discovery obtruded on several persons in that University. This fact affirmed by Dr. Peter Gunning, upon whom such an oath was urged; but denied by Mr. Simeon Ashe, one of the earl of Manchester's chaplains—Plunder of the treasury of Magdalen-College, Oxford. Bishop Wainefleet and Dr. Humphrey—Plunder of valuable timber belonging to Clare-Hall, Cambridge. Restitution of the stolen property—Archbishop Williams's inclinations towards the parliament, and his subsequent active exertions in aid of that party. His chasteness. His acts of benevolence especially to young students in both the Universities. Explanation of the expenses incurred in the repair of Westminster abbey. His views respecting popery, and his favour "to some select persons" of that opinion. The degree of esteem in which he held the English Liturgy. Translations of it into foreign languages. His antipathy to king Charles. Pages 553—660.

## APPENDIX TO HEYLIN'S ANIMADVERSIONS.

CONTAINING THE APOLOGY OF DR. JOHN COSIN, IN ANSWER TO SOME PASSAGES IN FULLER'S CHURCH-HISTORY.

Heylin's Introduction—Extract from the Church-History concerning Dr. Cosin—Dr. Cosin's "Answer." Account of prebendary Smart, and of the proceedings of the High-Commission court against him. His contumacy. His bill of complaint preferred to the House of Commons, containing charges against Dr. Cosin, who answers them *seriatim* before the House of Lords, in such a satisfactory manner, that he was released from all further attendance on them in reference to this matter. A summary of his answers to the various charges of Smart, who, by the artful misrepresentations of his sufferings as a suspended and silenced preacher, obtained large contributions and a handsome maintenance from those who disliked episcopacy. Though Smart demanded many thousand pounds, the parliament gave him none, nor ordered Dr. Cosin or any of those whom he had accused to make him retribution. Dr. Cosin's declaration respecting his intimacy with the French presbyterians at Charenton; the interchange of civilities between them, the English episcopal clergy and laity frequenting their church, and, in return, they came to the episcopal church. Dr. Cosin has been "to pray and sing psalms with them, and to hear both the weekly and the Sunday sermons at Charenton." Daillé's character of Dr. Cosin. Fuller's Apologetical Letter to him, and his promised account of the highly venerated bishop of Durham—Fuller's epistle to the reader—To his loving friend, Dr. Peter Heylin—Notices by the Editor concerning Dr. Cornelius Burgess, and Fuller's Letter to him. Pages 661—685.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PLATES. Pages 686—688.







Plate

1

Plate



2




3




4



5



6



7



8



9



10



THE ARMS OF PATRONS.

TO THE HONOURABLE  
**BANISTER MAYNARD, ESQUIRE,\***  
SON AND HEIR TO THE  
RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM LORD MAYNARD,  
BARON OF ESTAYNES IN ENGLAND, AND  
WICKLOW IN IRELAND.

---

THERE is a late generation of people, professed enemies to all human learning; the most moderate amongst them accounting it, as used in Divinity, no better than the barren fig-tree:—"Cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground?" Luke xiii. 7; whilst the more furious resemble it to the wild gourd in the potage of the children of the prophets, deadly and pernicious, 2 Kings iv. 40. Thus as "Wisdom builded her an house" with "seven pillars," Proverbs ix. 1, generally expounded "the liberal sciences," Folly seeketh (but I hope in vain) to pluck down and destroy it.

The staple place whereon their ignorance or malice, or both, groundeth their error, is on the words of the apostle: "Beware lest any man should spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit," Col. ii. 8; or, which is the same in effect, vain and deceitful philosophy.

Which words, seriously considered, neither express nor imply any prohibition of true philosophy, but rather tacitly commend it. Thus, when our Saviour saith, "Beware of false prophets," Matt. vii. 15, by way of opposition, he inviteth them to believe and respect such as are true ones.

\* Called by our antiquarians, "Banastre Maynard, of Estaines and Turrin, in Essex."  
--EDIT.

Indeed, if we consult the word in the notation thereof, consisting of φιλῶ, "to love," and σοφία, "wisdom," nothing can be cavilled thereat; the child of so good parents cannot be bad: and the compound resulting thence, namely, PHILOSOPHY, or "the love of wisdom," is the same so commended by Solomon: "Whoso loveth wisdom, rejoiceth his father," Prov. xxix. 3.

True philosophy, thus considered in itself, is, as Clemens Alexandrinus termeth it, *æternæ veritatis sparagmon*, "a spark or splinter of Divine truth;" *res Dei ratio*, saith Tertullian; God himself being, in a sort, the great-grandfather of every Philosophy-Act.

But, we confess, there is a great abuse of philosophy, making it vain and deceitful, (according to the apostle's just complaint,) when it presumeth by the principles of reason to cross and control the articles of faith: then, indeed, it becometh κενή, "vain or empty," as wherein *nulla impletio, et multa inflatio*, "nothing to fill man's mind, though too much to puff it up;" which is true both of philosophy in general, and of all the parts thereof.

Thus Logic, in itself, is of absolute necessity, without which St. Paul could never have disputed "two years" (no, nor two hours) "in the school of Tyrannus," Acts xix. 9. So highly did the apostle prize it, that he desired to be freed ἀπὸ τῶν ἀτοπων, "from men who have no topics,"—from absurd men who will fix in no place to be convinced with reason. But Logic, thus useful, may be abused and made deceitful, either in doubtful disputations, where the questions can never be determined, or in "perverse disputings of men," 1 Timothy vi. 5, where the disputants are so humorous and peevish, that they are unwilling to understand each other; making wrangling, not satisfaction, the end of their dispute.

Ethics, in like manner, are of special use in Divinity; though not to be believed where they cross Chris-

tianity; namely, where they exclude humility from being a virtue, (on the erroneous account, that it is destructive to magnanimity,) which is the Christian's livery; ("Be ye clothed with humility, 1 Peter v. 5;") and the third part of all which God, in this world, enjoineeth us to perform, Micah vi. 8.

Natural Philosophy must not be forgotten, singularly useful in Divinity, save when it presumes to control the articles of our Creed. It is one of the four things for which the earth is moved: "A servant when he reigneth," Proverbs xxx. 22; and intolerable is the pride of Natural Philosophy, which should "hand-maid" it to Divinity, when once offering to rule over it.

Your Honour's worthy grandfather, William Lord Maynard, well knew the great conveniency, yea, necessity, of Logic for divines, when he founded and plentifully endowed a Professor's place in the University of Cambridge for the reading thereof;—of Cambridge, which I hope ere long you will grace with your presence, who in due time may become a student and good proficient therein; learning being no more prejudicial to a person of honour, than moderate ballast to the safe sailing of a ship. Till which time, and ever after, the continuance and increase of all happiness to you and your relations, is the daily prayer of

Your Honour's humble servant,  
THOMAS FULLER.

## PREFACE.

---

ALTHOUGH the foundation of this University was far ancients [than the Conquest], yet because what before this time is reported of it is both little and doubtful, and already inserted into the body of our Ecclesiastical History; it is early enough to begin the certain History thereof. Far be it from me to make odious comparisons between Jachin and Boaz, the two pillars in Solomon's Temple, 1 Kings vii. 21; by preferring either of them for beauty and strength, when both of them are equally admirable. Nor shall I make difference betwixt the sisters, (coheirs of learning and religion,) which should be the eldest. In the days of king Henry VI.\* such was the quality of desert betwixt Humphrey Stafford duke of Buckingham, and Henry Beauchamp duke of Warwick, that, to prevent exceptions about priority, it was ordered by the Parliament, that they should take precedency by turns, one one year, and the other the next year; and so by course were to chequer or exchange their going or setting all the years of their life. Sure I am, there needeth no such pains to be taken, or provision to be made, about the pre-eminence of our English Universities, to regulate their places; they having better learned humility from the precept of the apostle: "In honour preferring one another," Rom. xii. 10. Wherefore I presume my aunt Oxford will not be justly offended, if in this book I give my own mother the upper hand, and first begin with her History. Thus, desiring God to pour his blessing on both, that neither may want milk for their children, or children for their milk, we proceed to the business.

\* *Ex bundello Petitionum Parliamenti anno 23, Henrici VI. num. 12.*

THE HISTORY  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,  
SINCE THE CONQUEST.

---

SECTION I.

1. *The low Condition of Cambridge at the Conquest.* 1 William the Conqueror. A.D. 1066.

AT this time the fountain of learning in Cambridge was but little, and that very troubled. For of late the Danes (who at first, like an intermitting ague, made but inroads into the kingdom, but afterwards turned to a quotidian of constant habitation) had harassed all this country, and hereabouts kept their station. Mars then frightened away the Muses, when the Mount of Parnassus was turned into a fort, and Helicon derived into a trench. And at this present, king William the Conqueror, going to subdue the monks of Ely that resisted him, made Cambridgeshire the seat of war.

2. *Cambridge Castle built by King William.* A.D. 1070.

For, to the town of Cambridge he retired; and there for a season reposed himself, half dead with sorrow, that his design against the aforesaid monks took no effect. At what time he found in the town three hundred and eighty-seven dwelling houses; eighteen whereof he caused then to be plucked down,\* to make room for the erecting of a Castle, which he there re-edified, that it might be a check-bit to curb this country, which otherwise was so hard-mouthed to be ruled. This Castle, here built by him, was strong for situation, stately for structure, large for extent, and pleasant for prospect; having in it, amongst other rooms, a most magnificent Hall; the stones and timber whereof were afterwards begged by the Master and Fellows of King's Hall,† of king Henry IV. towards the building of their chapel. At this day the Castle may seem to have

\* CAMDEN'S *Britannia* in Cambridgeshire.  
page 117.

† CAIUS, *Historia Cant.* Acad. lib. ii,

run out of the gate-house, which only is standing and employed for a prison : so that what was first intended to restrain rebels without it, is now only used to confine felons within it. There is still extant also an artificial high hill deeply intrenched about, steep in the ascent, but level at the top, which endureth still in defiance of the teeth of time ; as the most greedy glutton must leave those bones (not for manners, but necessity) which are too hard for him to devour. King William had scarce finished this Castle, when it was first handselled with the submission of the abbot of Ely, who came hither to bewail his errors, and beseech the king's mercy,\* having formerly paid seven hundred marks to preserve the life and liberty of himself and his convent. Besides, when that money came to be paid, and one groat thereof was found wanting in weight, a new sum was extorted from him for breach of covenants ; † to teach them who are to deal with potent creditors, to weigh right, lest otherwise they approve themselves penny wise, and pound foolish.

3, 4. *Henry Beauclerk bred in Cambridge; probably a Benefactor to the University. A.D. 1080.*

Now, though these martial impressions did much discompose the studies of scholars in Cambridge, under William the Conqueror ; who, being a military man, by his very constitution was not overfond of learning ; yet even in these days the place was not totally abandoned of scholars. Yea, Cambridge was in some reputation and eminence for literature. For Henry, youngest son to king William, was here brought up in the study of arts and sciences ; ‡ and afterwards he travelled beyond the seas ; being at Paris, some say, (though improbable,) when news was brought of the death of his brother king William Rufus : so that both home-bred and foreign learning met in him, to deserve the surname of BEAUCLERK. His father is reported to have designed him for a bishop ; as Maud, wife to this Henry, is said by her parents to have been intended for a nun ; and these two, marrying together, were the most learned couple in that age.

Some say, § that this Henry, afterwards king of England, in gratitude to Cambridge for his education, endowed Readers of several languages therein, alleging Leland's verses, as alluding thereunto :—

*Quid quod Granta novem dicata Musis,  
Henrici pietate literati  
Tersis prænitet erudita Linguis.*

\* CAIUS, *Historia Cant. Acad.* lib. ii. page 117.  
William the Conqueror.

† THOMAS RUDBURN, LELAND, FABIAN, BALE, and  
PITZÆUS, page 203.

‡ SPEED in the Life of king  
§ CAIUS, *De Antiquitate Cantab. Acad.* page 97.

“ Cambridge, devoted to the Muses nine,  
By learned Henry’s piety doth shine  
With learned men, which languages refine.”

But we will not wrest the words beyond the intent of the poet, who herein seems to relate to the Hebrew and Greek Professors founded in his days at Cambridge by king Henry VIII. whom we may call Beauclerk junior, though short as in time, so in learning, of the former. Thus though for the present we will not build the bounty of this king Henry to Cambridge on a false bottom, yet certainly he was a dutiful son to his mother, from whom he had his breeding, and not forgetting her favour unto him.

5. *Mischievous Montgomery.* 1 William II. A.D. 1088.

Not long after, Roger of Montgomery most mischievously with fire and sword destroyed the town and county of Cambridge, spoiling the poor subjects, so to be revenged of their sovereign, king William Rufus; insomuch as, for a time, the University was wholly abandoned.

6. *Picot’s Foundation in St. Giles’s Parish.* A.D. 1092.

Hugolina, a worthy woman, and wife to Picot baron of *Burne*, [Bourn,] and sheriff of Cambridgeshire, recovered at Cambridge of a desperate sickness; whereof, in gratitude, according to the devout mode of those days, she built a church there, dedicating it to God and St. Giles, and placed six canons therein. Yea, she prevailed so far with her husband, that he endowed this her church with half the tithes of his demesnes in his manors of, 1. Qui, 2. Stow, 3. Water-Beach, 4. Middleton, 5. Histon, 6. Impington, 7. Girton, 8. Oakington, 9. Rampton, 10. Cottenham, 11. Lolworth, 12. Trumpington, 13. Haslingfield, 14. Harleton, 15. Eversden, 16. Toft, 17. Caldecote, 18. Kingston, 19. Wimpole, 20. Gransden, 21. Hatley, 22. Pampisford, 23. Alewind. But, soon after, these tithes were but poorly paid; namely, when Robert Picot, his son, forfeited his barony, which king Henry I. bestowed upon Pagan [Pain] Peverel.

7. *The injurious Original of Impropriations.*

See we here a grand difference betwixt the endowments of monasteries before and after the Conquest. The Saxons generally endowed them with solid and substantial revenues out of their own estates, giving good farms and manors unto them: (or if any tithes, only those within the circuit of that parish wherein that convent was erected; the secular priests, and afterwards the monks therein, being presumed to take some spiritual pains in that place, to the



deserving thereof :) this properly was frank-almonage, bestowing on God in his church, as they accounted it, what was their own, to estate upon Him. But the Normans embraced a cheaper way of dotations, chiefly bestowing all or part of the tithes of their lands on convents of their foundation, payable out of parishes lying a good distance from the same ; and this was according to the French fashion. Now, if it be true that tithes be due *jure Divino*, this was no gift, but a payment, which they were bound to tender to the church ; yea, which is more, such grants of tithes were no better than felony, robbing the ministers of their respective parishes of what was due unto them : insomuch that they took the oil from the wick, (the pastor labouring in his church,) and gave it to the thief or waster in the lamp, to which the idle monks may fitly be compared.

8. *Cambridge first made a Corporation.* 2 Henry I. A.D. 1101.

To repair the damage lately done by Montgomery to the town of Cambridge, king Henry I. bestowed many privileges thereon, which the University is so far from repining, she rejoiceth thereat. For, well may the jewel delight to be put in a handsome cabinet. He freed the town from the power of the sheriff, making it a corporation, upon the payment of one hundred and one marks yearly into the exchequer ; which sum the sheriff paid before for his profits out of the town, when it was under his jurisdiction. Besides, whereas the ferry over the river Grant was a vagrant before, even any where, where passengers could get waftage over, by authority and custom it now began to be fixed near Cambridge ; which brought much trading and concourse of people thereunto.

9. *The Original of Midsummer Fair.* A.D. 1103.

About this time Barnwell, that is, Children's-well, a village within the precincts of Cambridge, got both the name thereof and a fair therein, on this occasion :—Many little children on midsummer (or St. John Baptist's) eve met there in mirth to play and sport together.\* Their company caused the confluence of more and bigger boys to the place. Then bigger than they, even their parents themselves, came thither, to be delighted with the activity of their children. Meat and drink must be had for their refection, which brought some victualling-booths to be set up. Pedlars with toys and trifles cannot then be supposed long absent, whose packs in short time swelled into tradesmen's stalls of all commodities. Now it is become a great fair, and, as I may term it, one of the townsmen's "Commencements," wherein they take their "degrees" of

\* *Liber Barnwellensis.*

wealth, fraught with all store of wares, and nothing, except buyers, wanting therein.

10. *The first Coming of Jews to Cambridge. A.D. 1106.*

Jews at this time came first to Cambridge, and possessed a great part of the town, called the Jewry at this day. Round-church in the Jewry is conjectured, by the rotundity of the structure, to have been built for their synagogue. Much like whereunto, for fabric and fashion, I have seen another at Northampton, where Jews about the same time had their seminary. Some will say, Cambridge, an inland town of small trading, was ill-chosen by these Jews for their seat; where the poor scholars, if borrowing from these usurers, were likely to bring but small profit unto them. But let it suffice, that the Jews chose this place, whom no Christians need advise, for their own advantage. Here their carriage was very civil; not complained of, as elsewhere, for cruel crucifying of Christian children, and other enormities.

11—13. *Cambridge restored to Learning by the Abbot of Crowland. A Grain of Seed soon grown a Tree. The Time of this Author's Writing. A.D. 1109, 1110.*

Now the reader is requested seriously to peruse the following passage as faithfully transcribed out of an excellent author,\* and of high concernment in this our history:—"Joffred, abbot of Crowland, sent over to his manor of Cottenham, nigh Cambria, Gislebert, his fellow-monk, and professor of Divinity, with three other monks; who, following him into England, being thoroughly furnished with philosophical theorems, and other primitive sciences, repaired daily to Cambridge; and, having hired a certain public barn, made open profession of their sciences, and in short space of time drew together a great company of scholars.

"But in the second year after their coming, the number of their scholars grew so great, as well from out of the whole country, as the town, that the biggest house and barn that was, or any church whatsoever, sufficed not to contain them. Whereupon, sorting themselves apart in several places, and taking the University of Orleans for their pattern, early in the morning, monk Odo, a singular grammarian, and satirical poet, read Grammar unto boys, and those of the younger sort assigned unto him, according to the doctrine of Priscian, and Remigius upon him. At one of the clock, Terricus, a most witty and subtle sophister, taught the elder sort of young men Aristotle's Logic, after the introductions of Porphyry, and the comments of Averrhoes. At three of the clock, monk William

\* P. BLÆSENSIS in his Additament to the History of Ingulphus.

read a lecture in Tully's Rhetoric, and Quintilian's *Flores*. But the great Master Gislebert, upon every Sunday and holy-day, preached God's word unto the people. And thus out of this little fountain, which grew to be a great river, we see how the city of God now is become enriched, and all England made fruitful by means of very many Masters and Doctors proceeding out of Cambridge, in manner of the holy paradise," &c.

This author writ some fifty years after the coming of these Crowland Professors to Cambridge; so that, who seriously considereth how learning there, from a contemptible occasion, by small means, in so short a time, improved itself to so great a height, will conclude much of Providence therein; and we may observe, according to Scripture expression, "God had prepared the people, for the thing was done suddenly," 2 Chron. xxix. 36.

14, 15. *An apparent Injury offered to Cambridge. She is vindicated from such as traduce her.*

But some adversaries to the antiquity of Cambridge represent and improve this action much to her disadvantage, as if newly now, and not before, she began to be an University; objecting, that "if scholars were at Cambridge before the coming of those four Professors thither, they showed small civility in giving those strangers no better entertainment; to whom they should have said, as once Laban to Abraham's servant,—“Come in, ye blessed of the Lord, wherefore stand you without?” Gen. xxiv. 31, welcoming them to their Halls, Hostels, Chambers, Studies, with the best fare their present condition afforded; especially, seeing scholars (of all men) are soonest acquainted, the sameness of profession commonly making them familiar at the first sight. It seems, therefore, that, at their coming thither, either Cambridge had no scholars in her, or her scholars had no manners in them; yea, had not read so much as Tully's 'Offices,' to teach them civility to strangers professing learning, but suffered them to live, and read in a barn, by themselves."

In answer hereunto, may the reader be pleased to take into his impartial consideration the following particulars:—

1. Not much more than twenty years since, that mischievous man, Robert of Montgomery, had despoiled Cambridge. And no wonder, if the blackbirds were slow in flying back to their nests, which had been so lately destroyed.

2. Yet a racemation at least of scholars either remained in Cambridge all that plundering time, or returned soon after it. For we find king Henry I. in the second [year] of his reign, by order, commanding some civilians there to perform their Acts, and pay the

beadles their fees, which formerly they refused; and this was some years before the coming of the Crowland Professors hither.\*

3. Probably some emulation, not to say envy, (a canker we find fretting the fairest flowers,) might make some distance betwixt the old stock of standing scholars in Cambridge, and this new addition of Professors. Our aunt Oxford may easily remember what little love, yea, how great grudging, there was betwixt her ancient students, and that new plantation of scholars which St. Grimbald,† under king Alfred, first placed there.

4. The marvellous increase of learning in Cambridge, in so short a time after the coming of the Crowland Professors thither, is justly imputed to this cause,—for that Cambridge had formerly been a place of learning. Thus when green wood is long in kindling, brands (which before were half-burnt, and then quenched) do quickly take fire, and presently blaze into a bright flame.

In a word, such men who have made remarkable additions to what was begun long before, often-times, as proudly as falsely, conceit themselves the first founders thereof. Thus Nebuchadnezzar: “Is not this great Babylon that I have built?” Daniel iv. 30. Whereas he, and all the world, knew that Semiramis built it a thousand years before his cradle was made, though he no doubt might strengthen, enlarge, and beautify the same. And, as restorers are apt to mistake themselves for the founders, so, by infection of the same error, the spectators of such repairers are prone to misinterpret them for beginners; as here these Crowland Professors are erroneously apprehended the founders of Cambridge. Thus the river Anas, in Spain, after it hath run above sixty miles under ground, may be by ignorant people conceived to have his birth, his fountain, there, where in truth he hath but his resurrection at his springing out of earth the second time. And thus sluggards in the morning count the sun but then to arise, when it newly breaks forth of a cloud, and was risen some hours before.

#### 16. *Pain Peverel founds Barnwell Priory.* A.D. 1112.

Pain Peverel, standard-bearer to Robert duke of Normandy, in the Holy Land, removed Picot's foundation from St. Giles in Cambridge, (where they were pent for room,) to a larger place, of thirteen acres, at Barnwell, about a mile off, where one Godesonn formerly led a hermitical life. This Peverel increased the number of those canons from six to thirty, (because, forsooth, at that time he was just thirty years old,) and endowed them with large revenues. Afterwards, in process of time, Barnwell became a prime priory, through the bounty of many benefactors, and able at the

\* CAIUS, in *Historia Cantab.*

† *Vide supra*, “Church History,” vol. i. p. 183.

dissolution of abbeyes to expend, of old rents low-rated, three hundred fifty-one pounds, fifteen shillings, four-pence; insomuch that the prior thereof, in the forty-ninth year of king Henry III. by writ, bearing date at Woodstock, the twenty-fourth of December, was, with many more, *voluntariè summonitus*, “freely summoned,” saith the record, to be present as a baron in Parliament. But let him make much of this favour, which never before or after was bestowed upon him or his successors. These black canons of Barnwell were generally kind neighbours to the scholars, and their prior did sometimes good offices unto them.

17. *Alphred of Beverley, Student in Cambridge. A.D. 1129.*

Now, amongst the eminent scholars who at this time studied in Cambridge, Alfred of Beverley was of especial note.\* He was born in Yorkshire, lived many years in Cambridge to gain learning; where he attained to be an excellent philosopher, divine, and historian. Returning into his native country at Beverley, he wrote the history of the British nation, from the beginning of the world unto his own age; which work was by him truly and elegantly composed. He is commonly surnamed “the treasurer;” a title given him, as I conceive, not for bearing that office in his convent, but from his diligent searching, discreet selecting, methodical compiling, and careful preserving, or *treasuring up*, precious passages of former ages for the use of posterity. This Alfred, when living in Cambridge, maintained himself (as the rest of the students there) on his own cost; every scholar in that age being his own founder and benefactor. For, as yet, no public halls or hostels were built for to receive them, but each one lived, as St. Paul at Rome, “in his own hired house,” Acts xxviii. 30, as they could contract with the townsmen; who, unconscionably improving themselves on the scholars’ necessities, extorted unreasonable rents from them; as hereafter, God willing, shall appear.

18. *Unwonder me this Wonder.*

And here I must admire one thing, and shall be thankful to such who will cure my wonder, by showing me the cause of that I wonder at:—“What might be the reason, that monks and friars in this age had such stately houses, rich endowments, plentiful maintenance? whilst students in the University had poor chambers, hard fare, short means, and that on their own or parents’ charges: and yet there was more honesty, industry, painfulness, and piety within the study of one scholar, than [within] the cells of a hundred monks?” Some, perchance, will impute this to the fancy of men,

\* BALE, *De Scriptoribus Britan. Cent. II.* page 157.

—lapping, dandling, and feeding monkeys and marmosets, while creatures of more use are less regarded. Others will say, “It was because scholars studied the liberal—monks the lucrative—sciences; university-men were more busied in reading books, than mumbling of masses, and praying for the dead,—the main matter which brought grist to the monks’ mill.” Whatever was the secret cause, this was the apparent effect thereof:—Scholars, as they were lean, so they were lively, attracted less envy, procured more love, endured more labour, which made them to last and to live after the destruction of the other.

19. *The first Earl of Cambridge.* 4 Stephen. A.D. 1139.

William [de] Meschines, brother to Ranulph earl of Chester, was by king Stephen made the first earl of Cambridge. And it is no small credit to Cambridge, that, after this William, none were ever honoured with that title, but such who were princes of the blood royal;—either actual kings of Scotland, or kings’ sons or nephews of England, or foreign and free princes of their next alliance; as hereafter, God willing, will appear at their several creations: So careful were our English kings in choosing such persons for the place, who, receiving honour from so famous an University, might also, by their high birth and honourable demeanour, return lustre thereunto.

20. *David King of Scots, Earl of Cambridge.* A.D. 1144.

For after the death of this Meschines, one may confidently pronounce, that David king of the Scots (commonly called St. David) was earl of Cambridge: and although his charter cannot be produced with the formalities used at his creation, (modern ceremonies at the investing of counts not being used in that age,) yet, that he was effectually earl of Cambridge, by the ensuing evidence doth sufficiently appear. It is a grant made by Maud the empress, daughter of king Henry I. unto Aubrey de Vere, afterward earl of Oxford; part whereof (so much as concerns the present point) we have here transcribed, translated, and commented on, conceiving it to contain some criticisms in history and heraldry worthy observation.\*

*Concedo quòd sit Comes de Cantebruggescire, et habeat inde tertium denarium sicut Comes debet habere. Ita dico si Rex Scotie non habet illum Comitatum. Et si Rex habuerit, perquiram illud ei ad posse meum per Escambium. Et si non potero, tunc do ei, et concedo, quòd sit Comes de quolibet quatuor Comitatum subscriptorum, viz. Oxenfordscire, Berkscire, Wiltscire, et Dorsetscire, per*

\* Extant among the Records of the earls of Oxford cited at large by Augustine Vincent, in his *Correction of Brook’s Errors*, page 393.

*consilium et considerationem Comitis Glocestriæ, fratris mei, et Comitis Gaufridi, et Comitis Gilberti.*

“ I grant that he be earl of Cantbruggeshire, and that he have from thence the third penny, as the earl ought to have. So I say, if the king of Scotland hath not that earldom : and if the king hath it, I shall to my power procure it him by exchange. And if I cannot, then I give and grant unto him, that he be earl of which he will of the four earldoms subscribed ; namely, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Wiltshire, and Dorsetshire ; by the counsel and advice of the earl of Gloucester, my brother, and of earl Geoffery, and of earl Gilbert.”

The date of this grant is uncertain ; but from the hand of her brother, the earl of Gloucester, subscribed thereunto, we collect that it must be before the year 1146, wherein the said earl ended his life.

### 21. *Observations collected from this Grant.*

Out of this grant observe, First : That though Stephen, *de facto*, was king of England, yet the right was in this Maud the empress. Betwixt these two for many years it was “ catch who catch may,” both in gaining of places and giving of honours, as success befriended them. Secondly : That earls in that age were earls indeed, not merely titular, but substantial, as receiving the third penny (I humbly conceive it of the crown-revenues therein) of the county whence they had their honour. Thirdly : Kings of Scotland accounted it no abatement to their crown-royal, to wear with it an English coronet, holding (*in commendam*, as I may say) with their own crown one or more of English earldoms : as here king David held Cambridge in his own, and Huntingdon in right of his wife. Fourthly : As the counties of Cambridge and Huntingdon soon after the Conquest were united under one *comes* or “ earl ;” \* so they two (only of all shires in England) remain under one *vicecomes* or “ sheriff” at this day. Fifthly : Queen Maud earnestly endeavoured (in compliance, no doubt, with the desires of her favourite Aubrey de Vere) to confer the county of Cambridge upon him, as a place of principal honour, above the four other counties proffered unto him. Sixthly : The honour of the title of Cambridge arose from the famous University therein ; otherwise the aforesaid Aubrey, if consulting his profit, would clearly have preferred either Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Wiltshire, or Dorsetshire, as greater in extent, and therefore returning, by the third penny therein, larger revenues. Lastly : Seeing a good title of Cambridge could not be made to him, (as prepossessed by the

\* See CANDEN'S *Britannia* in Huntingdonshire.



Scotch king,) Aubrey was contented with and thankful for Oxford, as the other famous University in England; which title his noble and most ancient family enjoyeth at this day.

22, 23. *Nigellus's Foundation in Cambridge. Roger of Hereford, Student in Cambridge. A.D. 1145—1170.*

Nigellus or Neale, second bishop of Ely, having first obtained a faculty from the pope, founded an hospital for canons regular in Cambridge, in the place where now St. John's college is erected.\* He is said to have endowed the same with a hundred and forty pounds by the year, yearly rent: which, if so, in that age was a vast proportion.

Roger of Hereford, so named because born there, studied at this time in Cambridge, [and] became an admirable astronomer, philosopher, and chymist, diving much into the mysteries of metals. He wrote many books of astronomy and astrology, which for a long time were kept in Cambridge library, but not extant (I fear) at this day. Yet the Oxford antiquary† will by no means allow this Roger a student in Cambridge, as who flourished before the coming of the Crowland Professors thither: but whether more credit may be hung on this single *Twine*, than on the *twisted* testimony of Leland, Bale, and Pits, (all agreeing both in his education at Cambridge, and flourishing in this age,) be it reported to any ingenuous reader.

24, 25. *A merciless Fire. Oxford deserted, and partly removed to Cambridge. 9 John. A.D. 1174—1208.*

There happened a merciless fire in Cambridge; only so pitiful as to go out when no more fuel was left to feed the fury thereof. Most of the churches in the town (then built of wood, and therefore the more combustible) were burned in part, and Trinity-church wholly consumed.‡ Hence it was, that, for time to come, the steeple thereof was firmly built of freestone, to prevent, by God's goodness, the return of the like casualty.

A sad accident happened this year at Oxford.§ A clergyman and student in that University casually killed a woman, and fled upon it. The mayor of the city, with other officers, search after him, light on three of his chamber-fellows, both innocent and ignorant of the fact committed: these they injuriously thrust into prison, and, some days after, king John (a back-friend to the clergy, as continually vexed with their constant opposition) com-

\* GODWIN in *Episc. Ely*, page 306.  
page 219.  
page 228.

† CAIUS, *Hist. Cantab.*

‡ BRIAN TWYNE, *Apolog.* lib. ii.  
§ MATTHEW PARIS, in anno 1209,



manded them to be executed, “in contempt,” saith my author, “of ecclesiastical liberty.” Offended hereat, three thousand students at once left Oxford, as well masters as scholars; *ita quòd nec unus ex omni Universitate remansit*, “so that not one remained of all the University.” Of these some removed to Cambridge, some to Reading; so that in this total eclipse of learning therein, Oxford was left empty for a season.

26, 27. *John of St. Omer's, a Poet, bred in Cambridge. Joceline Brakeland, a Historian therein. A.D. 1209—1211.*

John of St. Omer's studied about this time at Cambridge. By his surname I should have conjectured him a foreigner of Artois, had not my author assured me, that he was born in Norfolk.\* Yea, when a monk of Peterborough, bred also in Cambridge, had, with his satirical Latin rhymes, abused the county of Norfolk, our John gave him as good as he brought; rhyme for rhyme, and jest for jest: yet his pen was so much the better employed than his adversary's, as the writer of a just vindication is to be preferred before a scurrilous libeller.

With more credit to himself, and profit to others, was Joceline Brakeland employed; who about this time in Cambridge improved himself in divine and human learning.† Afterwards he became a monk at Bury in Suffolk, where he was born; and of his own accord, unimportuned by any other, as faithfully as learnedly wrote the History of his convent, which he transmitted to posterity.

28, 29. *The University in a sad Condition; which still continueth. A.D. 1214—1217.*

Most miserable at this time was the condition of Cambridge. For the barons, to despite king John, with their forces harassed and destroyed the town and county thereof, taking Cambridge Castle by assault; and no wonder, when only twenty men were found therein, not enough to make good the twentieth part thereof,—such then was its capacity and extent. To cry quits with the barons, William earl of Salisbury, and Falk de Brent, (king John's favourite,) replundered Cambridgeshire;‡ leaving nothing worth any thing behind them, that was not too hot or too heavy for them to carry away.

And two years after, when Walter Buuk, with his Brabanters, destroyed the town and isle of Ely, and almost burned the minster therein,—not quenched with the water of her fens, but with the wise composition of prior Stephen: I say, when Ely was almost

\* BALÆUS, *Cent. iii.* page 261.  
PARIS, *anno 1215*, page 274.

† *Idem*, page 259.

‡ MATTHEW

*burned*, Cambridge no doubt was well *warmed*, as sorrowfully sensible of its near neighbour's calamity. The scholars then had steady heads and strong brains, if able to study in these distempers, when loud drums and trumpets silenced the sweet but low harp of Apollo. But we know how Archimedes was busy in making his mathematical figures, even when Syracuse was taken by soldiers; and possibly some grave students made their souls unconcerned in all these martial disturbances.

30—32. *Eels sent from Cambridge to Oxford. A Gaol made of a Jew's House. Privileges confirmed to Cambridge.*  
5 Henry III. A.D. 1221—1227.

The king, being at Oxford, sent to the bailiff of Cambridge, (as living near Ely, the staple of fish,) to send unto him such a proportion of eels, for the provisions of his court, and it should be discounted unto him out of the exchequer.

The king, by his letters to the sheriff of Cambridgeshire, gave order, that he should put the bailiffs of Cambridge into the possession of the house of Benjamin the Jew, (probably forfeited to the crown on his misdemeanour,) to make thereof a common gaol for their corporation.

The king confirmed to the townsmen of Cambridge the privileges conferred by his father upon them; namely, that the merchants of the guild in Cambridge should be free in all fairs in the king's dominions on this side and beyond the seas, *de theolonio, et passagio, et lestagio, et pontagio, et stallagio*. Ill would it be for the townsmen, should none of them enjoy the benefit of this royal charter till they perfectly understood the terms therein. In this grant provision is made, that nothing be done in prejudice of London; so careful were our kings always of that city; but whether that city reciprocally of them, let others inquire.

33. *Paris Students invited over into England.* A.D. 1229.

Sad at this present was the condition of the University of Paris; such murders were done, and affronts offered, to the students thereof. Our king Henry being half a Frenchman, (in the right of his queen,) and possessing many—pretending to more—dominions in France, taking advantage hereof, July 16th, “invited the Parisian students to come over into England, and to dwell in what cities, boroughs, and villages they pleased to choose:” \* an act no less politic than charitable, to fortify himself with foreign

\* *Ex Rotulo Patenti de anno decimo tertio regis Henrici III. membranâ sealâ in Turre Londinensi.*

affection ; knowing, that such Frenchmen, who in their youths had English education, would in their age retain English inclinations. We easily believe the greatest part of these strangers repaired to Oxford ; though Cambridge no doubt did share in them her considerable proportion.

34, 35. *Counterfeit Scholars do much Mischief. The Sheriff commanded to suppress these Malignants. A.D. 1231.*

A crew of pretenders to scholarship (as long as there are true diamonds, there will be counterfeit) did much mischief at this time in the University. These lived under no discipline, having no tutor, saving him who teacheth all mischief ; and when they went to act any villainy, then they would be *scholars*, to sin with the more secrecy and less suspicion. When cited to answer for their wickedness, in the Chancellor's court, then they would be *no-scholars*, and exempt themselves from his jurisdiction. No wonder if Cambridge was pestered with such cheats, seeing the church of Thyatira itself had those in her "which called themselves prophets," and were not, Rev. ii. 20. Civil students suffered much *by* and more *for* these incorrigible rake-hells, especially from such mouths who are excellent at an uncharitable synecdoche,—to call all after a part, and to condemn the whole University for a handful of hang-byes, such as never were matriculated members therein.

In vain did the Chancellor endeavour the suppressing of these "malignants," as the king calleth them in his letter to the sheriff ; the hands of the University being too weak to pluck up weeds so deeply rooted. In vain also did the Chancellor call in the assistance of the bailiff and burgesses of the town, who, as the king taxeth them in one of his letters, *aut impotentes fuerunt, aut negligentes*, to effect the matter. The business was at last, by command from the king, devolved to the sheriff, as appears by what followeth :—

*Rex Vicecom. Cantabrigiensi salutem.—Quoniam ut audicimus plures nominantur Clerici apud Cantabr. qui sub nullius magistri scholarium sunt disciplinâ et tuitione, sed potius mentiuntur se esse scholares cum non sint, ut tutius et fortius (visâ ad hoc opportunitate) queant malignari, tibi præcipimus, quòd assumptis tecum probis et legalibus hominibus de comitatu tuo, accedas ad villam nostram Cantabr. et per totam villam illam clamari facias ex parte nostrâ quòd nullus clericus moretur in villâ, qui non sit sub disciplinâ, vel tuitione alicujus magistri scholarium. Et si aliqui tales fuerint in villâ illâ, eâ exeant infra quindecim dies postquam hoc clamatum fuerit. Et si ultra terminum illum intenti fuerint in eâdem villâ, hujusmodi clerici capiantur, et in prisonam nos-*

*tram mittantur. Teste meipso apud Oxon. 3 Maii, anno regni nostri decimo quinto.\**

Thus the sheriff was empowered with a *POSSE comitatus* to redress this grievance: but whether or no with a *VELLE comitatus*, I know not. Sure I am, these clerks-no-clerks disturbed the University for many years after.

### 36, 37. *The Unconscionableness of the Townsmen regulated by the King's Letters.*

The townsmen of Cambridge began now most unconscionably to raise and rack the rent of their houses wherein the scholars did sojourn. Every low cottage was high valued. Sad the condition, when learning is the tenant, and ignorance must be the landlord. It came at last to this pass, that the scholars, wearied with exactions, were on the point of departing, to find a place where they might be better accommodated on more reasonable conditions.

Here the king seasonably interposed his power, appointing, that two Masters of Arts and two honest townsmen should be deputed as Chancellors, conscientiously to moderate the rigour of covetousness. And seeing scholars would hire as cheap, and townsmen would let as dear as they could, the aforesaid four persons, indifferently chosen out of both corporations, were to order the price betwixt both, according to the tenor of the king's letter ensuing:—

*Rex Majori et Ballivis Cantabr. salutem.—Satis constat vobis quòd apud villam nostram Cantabr. studendi causâ e diversis partibus tam cismarinis quàm transmarinis scholarium confluit multitudo, quod valdè gratam habemus et acceptamus, cum exemplum toti regno nostro commodum non modicum, et honor nobis accrescat, et vos specialiter inter quos fideliter conversantur, studentes non mediocriter gaudere debetis et lætari. Audivimus autem quòd in hospitibus vestris locandis tam graves et onerosi estis scholaribus inter vos commorantibus, quòd nisi mensurabiliùs et modestiùs vos habueritis erga ipsos in hâc parte, exactione vestrà faciente, oportebit ipsos villam vestram exire, et studio suo relicto a terrâ nostrâ recedere, quod nullatenus vellemus. Et ideò vobis mandamus, firmiter injungentes quatenus super prædictis hospitibus locandis, vos mensurantes secundum consuetudinem Universitatis per duos magistros et duos probos et legales homines de villâ nostrâ ad hoc assignandos, hospitia prædicta taxari, et secundum eorum taxationem ea locari permittatis; taliter vos gerentes in hâc parte, ne si secus egeritis propter quod ad nos debeat clamor pervenire, ad hoc manum*

\* *Ex Rotulo clauso de anno decimo quinto regis Henrici tertii in dorso in Turri London.*

*apponere debeamus. Teste meipso apud Oxon. tertio die Maii, anno regni nostri decimo quinto. +.*

*Ex rotulo claus. de anno xv. regis Henrici tertii in dors. in Turre London.\**

*Examinat. per Guil. Ryley.*

See we here : Cambridge appeareth not as an infant of yesterday, but a grave matron of great age ; witness those words, “ according to the custom of the University,” which show her gravity and gray hairs at the time of the date thereof.

### 38. *The Original of Taxers.*

This was the first original of the *taxatores* or “ taxers ” in Cambridge, so called at first from taxing, pricing, or rating the rents of houses. Their name remains, but office is altered, at this day. For after the bounty of founders had raised halls and colleges for scholars’ free abode, their liberality gave the taxers a writ of ease, no more to meddle with the needless pricing of townsmen’s houses. However, two taxers are still annually chosen ; whose place is of profit and credit, as employed in *matters of weight*, and to see the true gauge of all measures, especially such as concern the victuals of scholars. For, where the belly is abused in its food, the brains will soon be distempered in their study.

### 39—42. *The ill Effects of Tournaments; forbidden within five Miles of Cambridge. Mothers of Misrule. A sad Chance. A.D. 1245.*

Tournaments and tilting of the nobility and gentry were commonly kept at Cambridge, to the great annoyance of the scholars. Many sad casualties were caused by these meetings, though ordered with the best caution. Arms and legs were often broken, as well as spears. Much lewd people waited on these assemblies ; *light housewives*, as well as *light horsemen*, repaired thereunto. Yea, such the clashing of swords, the rattling of arms, the sounding of trumpets, the neighing of horses, the shouting of men, all day-time, with the roaring of riotous revellers all the night, that the scholars’ studies were disturbed, safety endangered, lodging straitened, charges enlarged, all provisions being unconscionably enhanced. In a word, so many war-horses were brought hither, that Pegasus himself was likely to be shut out. For, where Mars keeps his *term*, there the Muses may even make their *vacation*.

The king, being complained to thereof, did plainly show, that he preferred the quiet of the University before the profit of the town of

\* The same letters, in effect, were often confirmed by the king, in the fiftieth year of his reign.

Cambridge, gaining much money by these meetings; and therefore by his letters he enjoined, that no tilting should be kept within five miles of Cambridge. And yet so stout and sturdy were martial men in that age, that they hardly obeyed him. Yea, I find one Ralph de Kamois,\* a bold chevalier, who, notwithstanding the premisses, kept a riotous tilting in the very town of Cambridge; but soon after he was deeply fined for his high contempt; on the payment whereof, and his humble submission before the earls of Cornwall, Leicester, and Norfolk, he was forgiven.

Let us look on these tournaments, (unrelated to Cambridge,) as they were in themselves; and we shall find them the mothers constantly of misrule, commonly of mischief. Their very use (in their first constitution) was no better than an abuse, to cover malice under the cloak of manhood and merriment. Many brought personal grudges, some family-feuds, into the field with them; fewer returned than went forth, as either casually cut off, or intentionally murdered.

One instance of the former out of many; though full twenty-four miles from Cambridge:—Gilbert Marshal, earl of Pembroke, a potent peer of the land, proclaimed a disport of tournament, of running on horseback with lances, (in defiance of the king's authority, who had inhibited the same,) at Ware in Hertfordshire,† under the name, forsooth, of Fortune; as if Providence had nothing to do in such wild recreations. But so it *fortuned*, that this Gilbert, cast, bruised, and killed by his own horse, soon ended the mirth of the meeting. Call it not therefore “cowardice,” but “conscience and charity,” in the church, which, taking these tournaments (no better than solemn and ceremonious murder) in consideration, forbade Christian burial to such as should be slain therein; whilst the civil power proceeded severely against the slayer; and so betwixt both, with much ado, banished this barbarous custom. As for such tame tilting, (mere martial masques,) since used at court, being rather expensive than uncharitable, they are of a different nature.

#### 43. *Foul Work in Lent.* A.D. 1249.

“Strifes, fights, spoilings, breaking open of houses,” (it is not me, but Matthew Paris,‡ whom thou readest,) “woundings, and murder betwixt the burgesses” (probably first named, because most guilty) “and the scholars of Cambridge; and that in the very Lent, that, with the holy time, holy persons also might be violated. The noise thereof ascended to the ears of the king with a great complaint.”

\* *Ex Archivis Academiae Cant. eleganter descript. impensis R. Harrei ex Turra LONDONENSI.* † CAMDEN'S *Britannia* in Hertfordshire. ‡ *In anno 1249.*

44. *The first Founding of Peter-House. A.D. 1257.*

Hugh Balsham, sub-prior, (afterwards bishop of Ely,) began the foundation of Peter-House without Trumpington-gate near the church of St. Peter, (since fallen down,) from the vicinity whereof it seemeth to be denominated. As yet no revenue was settled thereon: only the students that lived therein (grinded formerly by the townsmen with unconscionable rents for the place of their abode) thankfully accounted themselves well-endowed with good chambers and studies freely bestowed on them. But more hereof hereafter; namely, *anno* 1284, when this college was enriched with possessions.

45—48. *Brawls and Bickerings betwixt southern and northern Scholars. The northern Men worsted. The Matter referred to the Judges itinerant; remitted to the former Commissioners. A.D. 1261.*

In vain did the care of the king (in favour of scholars) so lately remove tilting five miles from Cambridge, whilst now the scholars in open hostility tilted one against another,—the southern against the northern men therein. What! can the Muses themselves fall out, and fight in the field five against four? I find not the first cause of the falling-out betwixt northern and southern men. Surely the mere distance of their nativity did not cause their difference, because the one was born nearer to the sun than the other! But, however the brawl began, the northern men were worsted in the end thereof. Strange, that Boreas, the most boisterous wind in all the compass, should be beaten by Auster. And yet the northern men, being fewer in number, and farthest from their friends, were overpowered by the numerosity and nearness of those of the south.

Indeed, the northern men appear rather to be pitied than condemned, in the whole managing of the matter, being only on the defensive to secure themselves; so that whilst the others fiercely and furiously assaulted them, a great riot was committed, and (too probable) some blood shed. Whereupon the king issued out his commission of Oyer and Terminer, November 24th, to three eminent persons; namely, Giles Argenton, then living eight miles off, at Horseheath, (since by inheritance, the seat of the ancient and honourable family of the Alingtons,) Henry de Boreham, and Laurence de Brook, to inquire into the matter, and proceed therein, as they should see cause, against the offenders.

But, soon after, the king was informed how the three aforesaid judges appointed behaved themselves very partially in the matter: whereupon the king took it out of their hands, and, by a new com-

\* *Rotulo Patent. de anno 45 Henrici tertii, membrum 23, in dorso.*





FOUNDERS OF COLLEGES.





mission, February 11th, referred the hearing and determining thereof to Nicholas de Tur and Nicolas de Handlo, the judges itinerant of that Circuit. Yet, in favour of the scholars who had offended, he limited the proceedings of these judges with an—*ita tamen quòd ad suspensionem vel mutilationem clericorum non procedatis, sed eos alio modo per consilium Universitatis Cantabr. castigetis.\**

It seems, the case was of some difficulty, and many persons of quality concerned therein, the deciding whereof was so often in so short a time bandied backwards and forwards at court. For, few days after, H. le Despencer, *Justiciarius Angliæ*, by command from the king, inhibited the foresaid judges itinerant to intermeddle therein, and wholly remitted the business to the examination and determination of Giles Argenton, Henry de Boreham, and Laurence de Brook, before whom some southern scholars, active in this riot, were indicted, found guilty, and condemned, when the king's gracious pardon was sent in their behalf, in form as followeth:—

*Rex omnibus ad quos præsentes literæ pervenerint salutem.—Sciatis nos de gratiâ nostrâ speciali pardonasse magistro Johanni de Depedale, magistro Hugoni de Thornham, Bartholomeo de Watton, Willielmo fratri ejus, Willielmo de Merton garcioni eorum, Willielmo de Wethringset, Mich. de Mereforde, Johanni de Dene, Waltero et Ricardo fratribus ejus, Johanni de Shotesham, Ed. de Merston, Waltero de Wodeford, Willielmo de Warburne, Nicholao de Brackden, Willielmo Saleman, Willielmo de Pikneham, et Johanni de Lon, de comitatibus Norff. et Suff., Rogero Parlebone, Bartholomeo Matelast, Henrico Ledwy, Johanni de Stokenham, Stephano Maymund, Pruetto le Cryur, Johanni de London, Thomæ Alnonechilde, Roberto de Frassenden, et Galfrido de Caxton, de comitatu Cantabrigiensi, sectam pacis nostræ quæ ad nos pertinet, pro insultu nuper facto in quosdam scholares boreales Universitatis Cantabr. et pro transgressionibus ibidem factis contra pacem nostram unde indictati fuerunt coram dilectis et fidelibus nostris Egidio de Argentein, Henrico de Borham, et Laurentio del Broke, quos illuc misimus ad inquisitionem faciendam de transgressionibus prædictis. Et firmam pacem nostram eis inde concedimus, ita tamen quòd stent recto si quis versus eos inde lai voluerit. In cujus, &c. Teste rege apud Turrem London. xviii. die Martii, anno regni nostri quadragesimo quinto. †*

*Ex rotulo patentium de anno xlv. regis Henrici tertii, membrana 15. in Turre London.†*

*Examinatæ per Gulielmum Ryley.*

\* Rotulo Pat. de anno 45 Henrici tertii, membrana 19, in dorso.  
in custod. Thesaur. et Camer. Scaccarii.

† Rotulo 12.

It seemeth some of these Anti-Boreals were men of genteel extraction, especially the two first, (styled in the pardon “masters,”) importing, I believe, more than the bare University-title: as also Bartholomew de Walton, and William his brother, because waited on by William de Merton, their *garcion*, that is, “their servant.” For it cometh from the French *garçon*, or the Italian *garzone*, and is used even by the barbarous Grecians of the middle age, γαρζουρίον παρὰ Λατίνοις τὸ παιδίον.\* It was graciously done of the king to pardon the man as well as his masters, seeing probably he acted only by their pleasure and command.

49, 50. *Northampton University begun, and dissolved.*  
A.D. 1262—1265.

During these discords, some scholars of peaceable disposition fairly departed Cambridge, and retired to Northampton; where, by the leave and liking of the king, they began an University. Here they met with many Oxford-men, who, on the like occasion, had deserted Oxford, and retreated hither to study. I commend their judgment in the choice of so convenient a place, where the air is clear, yet not over sharp; the earth fruitful, yet not very dirty; water plentiful, yet far from any fennish annoyance; and wood (most wanting now-of-days) conveniently sufficient in that age. But the main is, Northampton is near the centre of England; so that all travellers coming thither from the remotest parts of the land, may be said to be met by the town in the midst of their journey, so impartial is the situation thereof in the navel of the kingdom.

But this University never lived to commence Bachelor of Art; Senior Sophister was all the standing it attained unto. For, four years after, the king, apprehending that Northampton University would be prejudicial to Oxford, near to which it lay, within thirty miles; and therefore, as a true honourer of antiquity, (loath that a novice start-up should impair so ancient a founder,) recalled the scholars of Cambridge by these his ensuing letters:—

*Rex Majori et civibus suis Northampton. salutem.—Occasione cujusdam magnæ contentionis in villâ Cantabrigiensi triennio jam elapso subortæ nonnulli clericorum tunc ibidem studentium unanimiter ab ipsâ villâ recessissent, se usque ad villam nostram prædictam Northam. transferentes et ibidem (studiis inhærendo) novam construere Universitatem cupientes: Nos illo tempore credentes villam illam ex hoc posse meliorari, et nobis utilitatem non modicam inde provenire, votis dictorum clericorum ad eorum requisitionem annuebamur in hac parte. Nunc autem cum ex relatu*

\* Scholiastes Cedreni.

*multorum fide dignorum teraciter intelleximus quòd ex hujusmodi Universitate (si permaneret ibidem) municipium nostrum Oxon. quod ab antiquo creatum est, et a progenitoribus nostris regibus Angliæ confirmatum, ac ad commoditatem studentium communiter approbatum, non mediocriter læderetur, quod nullâ ratione velle-  
mus, maximè cum universis episcopis terræ nostræ ad honorem Dei et utilitatem ecclesiæ Anglicanæ et profectum studentium videatur expedire, quòd Universitas amoveatur a villâ prædictâ, sicut per literas suas patentes accepimus. Vobis de consilio magnatum nostrorum firmiter inhibemus ne in villâ nostrâ de cætero aliquam Universitatem esse, nec aliquos studentes ibidem manere permit-  
tatis, aliter quàm ante creationem dictæ Universitatis fieri con-  
suevit. Teste rege apud Westmon. primo die Febr. anno regni quadragesimo nono. +*

*Ex rotulo claus. de anno xlix. regis Henrici tertii, membr. 10 in dorso in Turre London.*

*Examinatæ per Gulielmum Ryley.*

There is still in Northampton a place called the College; but whether in relation to these students, I know not. Sure it is, that on the king's letters patents Northampton was un-universi-  
tied, the scholars therein returning to the place from whence they came.

51, 52. *Mr. Brian Twyne justly condemned, for injecting  
causeless Suspicions.*

Here I can hold no longer, but must fall out (and be the reader the judge betwixt us) with Mr. Brian Twyne, the writer of Oxford Antiquities. I honour him as an industrious though no methodical antiquary, his book being rather a heap than a pile. I commend his affection to his mother, had it been without detraction to his aunt; and his example shall quicken my duty in my filial relation where I owe the same. Lastly: Because he is (and I know not how soon I may be) dead, I shall deal the more mildly with him. For, he that falls heavy on a ghost or shadow, will, in fine, give the greatest blow and bruise unto himself. Yet some-  
thing must be said against him in vindication of the truth.

First. On all occasions, he is buzzing jealousies into the heads of the readers, to shake the credit of such authors, who write any thing in the honour of Cambridge. Thus, when Matthew Parker, arch-  
bishop of Canterbury, reports how many deserting Oxford removed to Cambridge, he squibs-in this parenthesis, (*Si illis standum sit Historiis quas Matthæus Parker, Cant. Archi. edidit,\**) dashing as much as lieth in his power the unstained reputation of those his

\* *Apologia Academiæ Oxon.* lib. iii. page 279.

worthy endeavours. And again, speaking of the same archbishop's setting-forth of Matthew Paris, he squirts-in this passage, *Si vera sit Matthæi Cant. editio*,\* suggesting some suspicion of falsehood and forgery in the same. Such ifs against great persons are more than ifs; and such suspicions, if they be not *scandala magnatis* against so great a peer, cannot be less than breach of canonical obedience against the memory of so grave and godly a prelate: especially seeing neither Twyne himself, (with all the help of Oxford-library,) nor all the world, could ever since find any fault in that edition, as faithfully agreeing with the most authentic manuscripts.

### 53. *His needless Cavil confuted.*

But these his slanting and suppositive [remarks] are nothing to his direct and downright traducing of the records of Cambridge. Take him in his own Latin words, which I have translated to this purpose, that such ingenuous Englishmen, never bred in either University, (and therefore the more impartial judges,) but understanding the strength of common sense and reason, may indifferently umpire the matter, and find the verdict, as they shall hear things alleged and proved.

*Non ignoro tamen in Memorabilibus Universitatis Oxon. a Roberto Haro collectis, unde hanc chartam desumpsi, in exordio diplomatis, Cantabrigiæ mentionem fieri, quasi et illa contentio triennio tum elapso Cantabrigiæ non Oxoniæ accidisset, et nota Universitas ea Northamptonensis a Cantabrigiensibus non Oxoniensibus fuisset inchoata. Eam tamen lectionem si nihil aliud, certè adulterata ipsius vocis CANTABRIGIÆ loco OXONIÆ scriptura,† et character a cæteris dissimillimo et toto exarandi genere diverso, corruptissimam prodit: Ubi enim occurrit, anno Dom. 1246, apud bonos et vetustæ fidei autores, tantas fuisse Cantabrigiæ discordias, quæ studentes Northamptoniam arcerent?—BRIAN TWYNE, Antiquitatis Academiæ Oxoniensis Apologia, libro iii. paginâ 280, numero 76.*

“ Yet I am not ignorant, that in the memorables of the University of Oxford, collected by Robert Hare, whence I have taken this charter, in the beginning of the patent there is mention made of Cambridge, as if this contention had happened three years since, at Cambridge, and not at Oxford, and that new University at Northampton begun of Cambridge- not of Oxford-men. Yet, if nothing else, truly the adulterated writing of the word CAMBRIDGE instead of OXFORD, and in a character most unlike from the rest, and different in the whole kind for the fashion thereof, betrayeth it to

\* *Apologia Academiæ Oxon.* lib. iii. page 280.  
 † *Mendum in transcripto Roberti Hari.*—TWYNE in the margin.

† *Mendum in transcripto Roberti*

be most corrupted. For where do we find, that, in the year of our Lord 1246, amongst good authors and of ancient faith, there were so great discords in Cambridge as to drive the students to Northampton ? ”

Here is too much for me to manage at once : we will parcel it, for the more effectual examination thereof, this being the first time that I have to do with this adventurous author. We know that if a merchant's bill be once protested against in the Exchange, he will scarce ever after recover his credit ; and if at first we can discover the falsehood of this our adversary, it will for ever give a mortal wound to his reputation, and ease us of much trouble hereafter.

54—56. *Quick Eyes to find a Fault where none is. Answer this Dilemma. The Tower Records clear the Cavil.*

First. He mentioneth Oxford monuments transcribed by Robert Hare. This Hare was an Esquire of good worship and wealth, a great lover and preserver (properties never parted) of antiquities. He carefully collected the precious monuments of both Universities, caused them fairly to be transcribed, and freely bestowed a duplicate, or double copy, on each of them ; a gift worthy the giver and the receiver, as of no less cost and pains to the one, than credit and profit to the other. Now, it seems Brian Twyne, with his piercing sight, is the Columbus, who, by “the different character,” hath discovered a new (not *world*, but) *word*, namely, Cambridge, in the king's letter to Northampton, put instead of Oxford. This he calls (as well he may) *mendum*, “a fault,” in Hare's transcript, which indeed was a falsehood ; and, if wilfully done, a forgery ; and the doer thereof, if detected, deserving to be pilloried for his pain.

But when and how, I pray, came this “Cambridge” to be surreptitiously inserted (instead of “Oxford”) into that transcript of Hare ? Was it done by himself, or some other, originally ? I mean, before those manuscripts were bestowed on the University. To allow this were to offer an injury to the honesty or vigilancy of that worthy antiquary. Or, was the false inscription made cunningly by some Cambridge-man, since those manuscripts came into the possession of Oxford ? If so, shame on the careless keepers of so precious a treasure ! I presume our muniments at Cambridge are more safely preserved.

I pass not what is or is not written in Hare's transcript. He that may with as much ease go to the fountain, and yet will drink of the dirty river, deserveth no pity, if choked (or rather, if choking himself) with the mud thereof. I appeal to the Records of the Tower of London, whence Hare's writings were copied out ; which

are the author of authors for English history, because, 1. They may be said to have lived in the time and place wherein all things are acted. 2. They are impartial; not, osier-like, bowing to any interest; but standing like a firm pillar, to support the truth. 3. They are safely preserved: and long may they be, in defiance of barbarous anarchy, which otherwise would make a bonfire, or new light, of those precious monuments.

I say, I repaired to the Records in the Tower; where I searched for, and found out, the aforesaid king's letter, by us lately exemplified, that the troubles of Cambridge, three years since, were the cause of the founding of the University at Northampton. This letter I got transcribed, compared, attested by Mr. William Ryley, the elder, keeper of those Records, and Norroy King of Arms; who, like a prince indeed, freely gave me his pains, which I commend to the reader's thankful notice; because, otherwise, I must have charged the cost on his account, raising the rate of my book, to make myself a saver thereby.

57, 58. *A needless Question declined. Why Oxford more prejudiced than Cambridge by Northampton University.*

But our adversary proceeds, and demandeth where we read "in any good author, that in the year 1246 such discords happened at Cambridge as should drive the scholars to Northampton?" We answer: First. We Cambridge-men are not ambitious of such discords; let us but retain the scholars, and let any place that pleaseth take those differences to themselves. Secondly. We never said, nor thought, that such broils were in Cambridge, *anno* 1246; but this we affirm, that three years since, namely, in the forty-sixth of Henry III.\* (which falls out to be the year of our Lord 1262,) cruel bickerings were betwixt the northern and southern men in our University, (and, perchance, the like might be by secret sympathy in Oxford,) which, as we have proved before, caused the departure of many to Northampton.

Some will say, "Seeing only mention is made in the king's letters to null Northampton University, because probable to prove prejudicial to Oxford; it seems thereby that Cambridge at this time was not considerable, at leastwise, the king not so careful for the preservation thereof." It is answered, The erection of a University at Northampton, by reason of the position of the place, must needs be a greater hurt to Oxford than hinderance to Cambridge: for Cambridge lieth conveniently for the north and east parts; Oxford, commodiously for the south and west parts, of England. Now, Northampton, lying within twenty-nine scruples

\* A half-year over or under breaks no squares.

of the same degree of longitude with Oxford, would almost share equally with Oxford in the western division of the land, whilst Cambridge quarters (as on the other side of the kingdom) would be clear, and little prejudiced thereby. But enough hereof. We proceed in our history.

## SECTION II.

REVERENDISSIMO ANTISTITI

JACOBO USSERIO, ARCHIEPISCOPO ARMACHANO,  
DOMINO SUO COLENDISSIMO.

CUM mihi CAMDENI *Britanniam* perlegenti locus \* occurreret, ubi meminit Jacobi Usserii, (tunc Cancellarii Sancti Patricii Dublinensis,) supra ætatem docti, variis de causis me primùm invasit, tandem absorpsit admiratio,—quòd tua indoles tantùm festinaret, quâ *juvenis* id assecutus es quod vel *viris* paucissimis datur;—quòd, cùm communis querela sit, “optima ingenia minimè diurnare,” tu, Dei favore, adhuc superstes es, quinquaginta annis, a quo hoc Camdeniano elogio decoratus fuisti;—quòd (Caleb alter nostri seculi) tibi hucusque judicium firmum, ingenium vividum, memoria tenax, animus integer;—utinam idem licuisset de corpusculo tuo dicere, quod nimiis studiis maceratum senio aliquantulùm cedere incipit.

At adhuc superest summus admirationis meæ gradus, tua in tantâ eruditione suspiciendâ humilitas, cùm ferè fit, ut illi omnes, quibus aliquid inest sublime et præcellens protinùs inflentur, et alios facilè contemnant; dum tu tenuitatem meam favore tuo beâsti, in quâ nihil quod alliceret, plurima quæ te depellerent.

Fateor sanè me beneficiis tuis ita obrui, ut ne respirandi copia concedatur, quâ gratias meas possim exprimere. Quoties enim mihi, vel legenti, vel scribenti, vel concionanti nodus inciderit, tu certissimus vindex,

\* *Qui annos variâ doctrinâ et judicio longè superat.* Page 752.



quem sæpius accessi turbidus, tortus, perplexus, nunquam reliqui nisi solutus et expeditus.

At omnium beneficiorum tuorum caput est, quòd pretiosa κειμήλια, (quibus vel æstimandis me imparem confiteor,) non rogatus, sponte comunicâsti; ita, ut omnia rariora Historia nostra accepta ferat tuæ munificentiae.

In hac nostrâ dedicatione non eousque impudentiæ processi, ut vel somniarem me aliquid proferre posse tuâ dignatione dignum; sed me ambire fateor, ut lux inoccidua nominis tui libro meo præfulgeat, quo Cantabrigiæ primordia (non quâ Academia, sed quâ ornata Collegiis, instructa redditibus) continentur.

Mihi sanè sæpius doluit, quòd tu, venerande præsul, Cantabrigiæ non fuisti educatus, et tantum decus matri meæ ereptum me malè habuit. Lenivit verò dolorem, cùm mecum opportunè recolerem, quòd ipsa Academia Dublinensis sit Cantabrigiades, (quasi colonia deducta e collegio Sanctæ Trinitatis,) quo nomine nostra alma mater te, licèt non filium, nepotem tamen, sibi summo jure vendicat.

Vale, reverendissime in Christo Pater, qui, licèt miles emeritus, indies tamen de ecclesiâ optimè ultrà mereri non desinis. Sanitati tuæ quæso consulas, cùm nihil sit certiùs quàm quòd tantò auctiùs commodum orbi Christiano est accessurum, quantò tu seriùs in cælum es rediturus.

1—3. *The King's Intentions to fortify Cambridge. Ditch made: Walls meant. Cambridge plundered on the King's Departure. A.D. 1266.*

HEAVY were the times now, and tumultuous, betwixt the king and his barons; mutually taking cities and castles one from another. The king, therefore, came to Cambridge, (the pass out of the west into Norfolk and Suffolk,) resolving to fortify the same. Indeed, we find some ancient writings which may probably insinuate Cambridge to be walled, time out of mind: as where we read in a charter of privileges granted to the town, *Extra muros burgi de Cantabrig.* Except some will be so morose to expound it only the

walls of private houses therein. However, at the present, such walls (if any) are utterly decayed.

The north-west part of Cambridge beyond the river (formerly farther extended than now-of-days) the king found sufficiently secured by an impregnable castle. The west side of the town was competently fenced with the river, anciently (before all endeavours of draining the fens) wider and deeper than now it is. Only the south and east of the town lay open, which the king intended to fortify. In order whereunto, he built two gates,—Trumpington-gate, by St. Peter's church, now ruined, on the south; Barnwell-gate, by St. Andrew's church, now decayed, on the east. And because gates without walls are but compliments in matter of strength, he intended to wall the town about, if time had permitted him.\* Mean while he drew a deep ditch (called King's-ditch at this day) round about the south and east parts of Cambridge.

Presently news is brought to him, that Gilbert earl of Clare had seized on the chief city of the realm. No policy for the king to keep Cambridge, and lose London the while. Thither marched he in all haste with his army, and may be said to carry the walls of Cambridge away with him, the design thereof sinking at his departure. Immediately after the king was gone away, one Hastings, a bold rebel, finding, be-like, the new ditch ill-manned, forced his passage over it, burned part, spoiled all the rest, of the town of Cambridge. Nor have I aught else to observe of this King's-ditch, save that, in our fathers' days, filled up with filth and mire, what was made for the fortifying, became a great annoying, of the University; until some fifty years since, partly at the cost of Dr. James Mountague, Master of Sidney's College, afterwards bishop of Winchester, a rivulet was let into the same; so not only clearing it, but turning the annoyance into a great conveniency of water to some Colleges, and to the town in general.

4—6. *Necton, first Carmelite Doctor in Divinity. Why Carmelites at first would not Commence. Necton first breaks the Ice, and others follow in his Track. A.D. 1269.*

Humphrey Necton about this time left Cambridge,—the first Carmelite who took on him the degree of doctorship, as Leland himself attesteth:—

*Laudibus Humphredum Necton super astra † feremus,  
Cui data Grantane laurea prima scholæ.*

“ Above the skies let's Humphrey Necton praise;  
For on him first Cambridge conferr'd the bays: ”

that is, made him Doctor in Divinity.

\* *Liber Barnwellensis*, POLYDORUS VIRGILIUS, et LELAND. † *Aliter* “*celebremus opimis.*”

True it is, these Carmelites, at their first coming hither, scrupled the acceptance of any academical degree, as having a secular smack therein, part of the pomp and vanity of the world, and therefore inconsistent with the holiness and humility of men of their mortified profession. Besides, this Order particularly pretends to wear on their shoulders a scapulary, being a narrow piece of cloth hanging down before and behind; the first of which fashion the Virgin Mary personally presented to one of their Society, with this compliment: "Receive this, my beloved, which I give unto thy Order, in sign of my fellowship." \* And hence it is that Carmelites call themselves "Brethren of the Order of the blessed Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel." Except therefore a Carmelite could actually *commence* an angel, he is a loser by his Degree, which in effect is but a degradation unto him. Besides, to wear a hood or habit of a Doctorate over the holy scapulary aforesaid, what were it else but preposterously to place earth above heaven? These considerations (weighty no doubt!) made the Carmelites for some time demur to the taking of any degree in Divinity.

However, Humphrey Necton first took heart, and, ten years ago, namely, 1259, commenced Doctor under William de Ludham, then Chancellor of Cambridge. Here he flourished many years, (and now went to Norwich, where he died, *anno* 1303, having been forty-four years Doctor,) especially after king Edward erected and endowed a convent for Carmelites in Mill-street in this University, since turned into Queen's College and Catherine Hall.

7, 8. *Oxford's Antiquary justly taxed. Petrus Blæsensis to be believed before Brian Twyne.*

The antiquary of Oxford discovereth envy or ignorance, or both, when, speaking of Leland's verses on Necton's commencing, [he] saith, *Quod ego certè de suâ sectâ non intelligo, quasi primus suæ sectæ Carmeliticæ gradum illum suscepisset, sed quasi simpliciter et absolutè primus*, "As if he had not been the first Commencer of his Order, but absolutely the first that ever took the degree of Doctorship in Cambridge:"—contrary to the express testimony of learned authors herein.†

JOHN BALE, *De Scriptoribus Britann.* page 312, originally a Carmelite in Norwich, (and therefore knowing in the men and matters of his own Order,) informeth us, that "Humphrey Necton, a Suffolk-man by birth, and Carmelite by Order, *ex omni suâ factione primus (tandem) fuit, qui Theologicus Doctor sit effectus.*"

JOHN PITS, *De Anglic. Scriptoribus*, page 388, an Oxford-man

\* See WEAVER'S "Funeral Monuments."  
demix Oxon. lib. iii. page 374.

† BRIAN TWYNE, *Apologia Aca-*

by education, (and therefore his testimony not to be refused by the Oxford antiquary,) acquainteth us, that the said “Necton, *Cantabrigiæ Ordinis sui omnium primus creatus est sanctæ Theologiæ Doctor* ;” “was the first of his Order made Doctor in Divinity.”

This Necton was afterwards public Professor in Cambridge, and set forth a book which he termed his *Lecturas Scholasticas*.

Now, although patience be a principal virtue amongst all those which Cambridge professeth and practiseth, yet can she not but complain of [the] Oxford antiquary’s injurious dealing herein, in making her solemnity of graduation then first to begin. The best is, Petrus Blæsenſis, who wrote in the reign of king Henry II. almost one hundred years before Necton’s birth, sufficiently clearſeth this point, and confuteth this cavil, when affirming, that, in his time, Cambridge did make glad the church of God and all England *per plurimos Magistros Doctoresque inde exeuntes*.\*

#### 9. Tournaments again forbidden. A.D. 1270.

Notwithstanding the frequency of disasters formerly mentioned, Cambridge quickly outgrew her miseries, much indebted therein to the care and courtesy of the king. Amongst many of his royal boons, this not the least, that, in favour of the scholars, he now renewed his former letters, to prohibit any tiltings or tournaments to be kept within five miles of Cambridge, according to the tenor following :—

*Rex omnibus ad quos præſentes literæ pervenerint, salutem.— Quia dilectis nobis in Christo magistris et cæteris ſcholaribus Universitatis Cantabr. per comites, barones, milites et alios, torneamenta ibidem exercentes, aventuras quærentes, et ad arma euntes, frequentibus ſolent pericula et incommoda multipliciter evenire, quæ ſi tolerarentur in diſcidium ibidem ſtudentium per proceſſum temporis cedere poſſint manifeſtè, quod ſuſtinere nolumus ſicut nec debemus : Nos indemnitati magistrorum et ſcholarium volentes in hac parte, quatenus fieri poterit, providere, conceſſimus eis de gratiâ noſtrâ ſpeciali quod torneamenta aliqua, aventuras, juſtæ, ſeu hujusmodi haſtiludia non fiant de cætero in villâ prædictâ ſeu per quinque milliaria circumquaque. Et prohibemus ſub gravem forisfacturam noſtram, ne quis de regno noſtro apud villam prædictam ſeu alibi infra prædicta quinque milliaria circumquaque torneare, juſtas facere ſeu aventuras, vel alia haſtiludia quærere præſumat, contra conceſſionem noſtram prædictam. In cujus rei teſtimonium hæc literas noſtras fieri fecimus patentes. Teſte meipſo apud Weſtmon. xxiv. die Julii, anno regni noſtri quinquageſimo quarto.†*

\* In *Appendice ad Ingulphum Crowlandenſem*. † Ex *Rotulo Patentium* de anno quinquageſimo quarto regis Henrici III. numero 330 in *Turre London*.

### 10. *Prince Edward ordereth an Agreement between the Scholars and Townsmen.*

The same year prince Edward came to Cambridge; one no less fortunate in peace than victorious in war. Here he understood, that frequent differences did arise betwixt the scholars and townsmen: for the future preventing whereof, he caused an instrument to be drawn up, and three seals annexed unto it; namely, his own, and the public seals of the University and town of Cambridge. Herein it was agreed betwixt them, that once every year, (namely, after Michaelmas, when the Masters resumed their lectures,) five discreet scholars should be chosen out of the counties of England, three Scottishmen, two Welshmen, three Irishmen, thirteen in all; who, joined with ten burgesses, (seven out of the town, and three out of the suburbs,) should see that the peace was faithfully kept betwixt all the students and inhabitants. By "suburbs" here we understand so much of the town as was left out of the line of the King's-ditch, which, to make it the shorter and stronger, took not in the straggling streets beyond the gates.

### 11. *No University as yet in Scotland and Ireland.*

For as yet, and for some succeeding ages, no University in Ireland. And although some forty years after, (namely, *anno* 1320,) Alexander Bicknor, archbishop of Dublin, obtained of the pope privileges for an University, and erected lectures at Dublin; yet presently the troublesome times frustrated so good a design, till towards the end of the reign of queen Elizabeth. As for Scotland, it was University-less till Laurence Lundoris and Richard Corvel, Doctors of civil Law, first professed learning at St. Andrew's, some hundred years after: till which time the Scottish youth repaired to Cambridge and Oxford for their education, as their bishops did to York for consecration, till they got an archbishop of their own, in the reign of king Edward IV.

### 12. *Cambridge receives all Countries.*

See we now Cambridge an University indeed, 1. By the universality *studiorum*; not confined (as in grammar-schools) to one faculty, but extended to the generality of arts. 2. By the universality *studentium*; not restrained to one country or kingdom, but admitting foreigners as well as natives. So that Brian Twyne might well have omitted his needless and truthless marginal note: *Cantabrigiense studium Henrici tertii temporibus valde fuit obscurum, si ullum.\**

13. *A Composition betwixt the University of Cambridge and the Archdeacon of Ely.* 4 Edward I. A.D. 1276.

Now began some differences between the scholars in the University and the archdeacon of Ely, who summoned them unto his courts, and by virtue of his office would have proceeded against them for non-appearance. The scholars denied any subjection due unto him; and, after a hot contest, both sides referred themselves to Hugh Balsham, bishop of Ely, who decided the controversy as followeth:—

*Universis Christi fidelibus præsentes literas inspecturis, Hugo Dei gratiâ Eliensis episcopus salutem in Domino.—Ad Universitatis vestræ notitiam tenore præsentium volumus peruenire, quòd nos affectantes tranquillitatem et pacem Universitatis nostræ Cantabr. regentium et scholarium studentium in eâdem, volentesque ut tam archidiaconus noster Eliensis circa sibi subditos quàm cancellarius Universitatis ejusdem circa scholares suos ita jurisdictionem suam separatim exerceant, ut uterque suo jure contentus non usurpet alienum: ad petitionem et instantiam præfati archidiaconi, nostri cancellarii, et magistrorum Universitatis prædictorum, (ab utrâque parte nobis traditis articulis,) ad æternam rei gestæ memoriam super his ordinamus infra scripta.*

*Inprimis volumus et ordinamus quod magister glomeriæ Cant. qui pro tempore fuerit, audiat et decidat universas glomerellorum ex parte reâ existentium, volentes in hac parte præfatum magistrum eodem privilegio gaudere quod habent cæteri magistri de scholaribus suis de causis eorum decidendis. Ita quòd sive sint scholares sive laici qui glomerellos velint continere, vel aliquid ab eis petere, per eam judicialis indaginis, hoc faciat coram magistro glomeriæ, ad quem decernimus hujusmodi causæ conditionem spectare pleno jure. Nisi hujusmodi causæ cognitio sit de pensionibus domorum per magistros et burgenses taxatarum, vel de facinoris enormis evidentiâ, ubi requiritur incarcerationis pœna vel ab Universitate privatio. In his enim casibus et non aliis respondeant glomerelli coram cancellario cuilibet querelanti, qui jurisdictionem suam exercet in his sicut est aliàs observatum. Si verò magister glomeriæ cognoscat inter scholarem actorem et glomerellum reum, et contigerit appellari ab interlocutoriâ vel a diffinitivâ sententiâ, volumus et ordinamus quod ad cancellarium appelletur, qui in ipsâ causâ appellationis procedat secundum ordinem observatum, cum ab alio magistro regente et de dictâ causâ sui scholaris cognoscente ab alterutrâ partium ad cancellarium appellatur. De causis verò glomerellorum inter se, et laicorum et glomerellorum, cancellarius in nullo intermittat, nisi causa sit de pensione domorum taxatarum, vel de enormitate delicti ut superius est expressum.*



*Et quia in statutis Universitatis vidimus contineri quod duo bedelli Universitatis intersint virgam deferentes omnibus vesperis, principiis, conventibus, defunctorum exequiis, et omnibus aliis convocationibus, nullo alio in præjudicio eorum virgam delaturo, præcipimus quod bedellus glomeriæ in prædictis convocationibus et locis coram cancellario et magistris virgam non deferat. In aliis autem locis quandocunque et ubicunque voluerit et maximè pro expeditione sui officii virgam liberè deferat licenter et quietè.*

*Et quia in statutis Universitatis ejusdem inter alia continetur, quod familia scholarium, scriptores et alii officia ad usum scholarium tantum deputata exercentes, eadem immunitate et libertate gaudeant quâ et scholares, ut coram archidiacono non respondeant sicuti nec scholares qui sunt eorum domini. Hoc ita tenore præsentium declaramus, quod in hoc casu nomine familiæ solummodò volumus contineri mancipia scholarium in domibus cum eis commorantia dum personaliter deserviunt scholaribus antedictis. Item nomine scriptorum et aliorum officia ad usum scholarium tantum deputata exercentium, volumus intelligi de scriptoribus, illuminatoribus, et stationariis qui tantum deserviunt scholaribus, quod sub cancellario respondeant, uxores tamen eorum super crimine adulterii vel aliuscujus cognitio et correctio ad archidiaconum spectat in casu consimili in personis aliis sibi subditorum diffamata, et reliqua eorum familia ad officium scholarium specialiter non deputata, archidiacono sint subjecti in omnibus et singulis sicut cæteri alii laici municipii Cant. et totius nostræ diœcesis Eliensis.*

*Quod autem apud Bernewell præsentibus archidiacono prædicto, cancellario, et aliis quorum intererat, inter eos verbaliter tantum ordinavimus, præsentibus inseri fecimus; videlicet, quod rectores ecclesiarum, vicarii, capellani parochiales et alii ecclesiarum Cant. ministri archidiacono per omnia subsint, sicut et alii de archidiaconatu suo adjiciendo, declarantes quod appellatione ministrorum ecclesiæ volumus in hoc casu contineri tam ipsum rectorem, vicarium et clericos ecclesiæ deservientes, quam presbyteros celebrantes missas beatæ Virginis et pro fidelibus, dum tamen ab aliquo parochianorum laicorum Cant. fuerint procurati, ibique moram faciant principaliter pro missis hujusmodi celebrandis, licet forsitan a (?) latere studere velint et scholas exercere. Si vero principaliter causâ studiorum ad municipium Cant. venerint, licet forsitan prædictas missas celebrent per parochianos procurati, volumus et ordinamus quod cancellarii jurisdictioni subsint omninò. Ita quod si dubitetur quâ intentione moram faciunt principaliter in municipio prædicto, super hoc stetur ipsorum presbyterorum juramento corporaliter præstando coram archidiacono et cancellario memoratis, et sic de hujusmodi presbyteri personâ ille jurisdictionem habeat omninò ad*

*quem ex eventu et virtute juramenti pertinebit in formâ superiùs annotatâ. Si verò rectores, vicarii, et ministri hujusmodi ecclesiarum Cant. fortè cum scholare contrahant, seu in actu scholastico delinquant, in his tantummodò casibus, et non aliis, coram cancellario ipsos præcipimus compelli respondere.*

*Ad hæc inter alia laudabile statutum et salubre a dictis cancellario et magistris editum diligenter inspeximus, nequis aliquem pro scholare tueatur qui certum magistrum infra quindecim dies postquam Universitatem idem scholaris ingressus sit non habuerit, aut nomen suum infra tempus prælibatum in matriculâ sui magistri redigi non curaverit, nisi magistri absentia vel justa rerum occupatio idem impediat. Immò si quis talis sub nomine scholaris latitare inteniatur, vel dejiciatur vel retineatur juxta regiam libertatem. Et licèt quilibet magister, antequam actualiter ad regimen admittatur, statutum hujusmodi fide præstitâ firmare teneatur, intelleximus tamen quòd plures magistri perjurii reatum sæpius incurrentes contra ejusdem statuti tenorem aliquos ut scholares defendendo fidem suam nequiter violarunt: propter quod volentes malitiis hominum obviare, præcipimus sub pœnâ excommunicationis nequis quenquam ut scholarem contra memorati statuti tenorem tueri, vel factorem sibi ut scholari in aliquo præbere præsumat.*

*Et quia ecclesiæ nostræ diœcesis nobis et archidiacono nostro sunt subjectæ, scholares verò Universitatis ejusdem subsunt cancellario memorato, præcipimus et mandamus quod sacerdotes scholares in utriusque præsentia vel ipsorum rices gerentium super suâ ordinatione examinentur, et approbentur vel reprobentur, prout digni vel indigni reperti fuerint.*

*Et ne jus nostrum negligere videamur qui alios in suâ justitiâ confortemus, inhibemus sub pœnâ excommunicationis, quam tenens in contrarium ipso facto incurrat, ne memorati cancellarius et Universitas divisim vel conjunctim, clàm vel palàm aliquid ordinet vel statuât, edita vel statuta hujusmodi obserret vel seruari faciat, in præjudicium nostræ jurisdictionis seu archidiaconi nostri Eliensis, nobis specialiter inconsultis et non præbentibus assensum hujusmodi statutis vel etiam statuendis: decernimus enim irritum et inane quicquid contra hanc nostram prohibitionem a quoquam ipsorum fuerit attemptatum.*

*Ad hæc quia jurisdictio dicti archidiaconi a jurisdictione præfati cancellarii tam ratione contractuum quàm personarum ac etiam causarum liquidò est distincta, ac constet utrumque esse nobis immediatè subjectum, nolumus ipsum archidiaconum vel suam familiam cancellario prædicto in aliquo subesse, nec ipsum cancellarium vel suam familiam in aliquo subesse archidiacono memorato. Sed uterque virtute propriæ potestatis suam propriam familiam corrigat, ipsam ad*



*juris regulas reducendo. Ita quòd si necessarium fuerit superioris auxilium in his de quibus ecclesia judicat, ad nos vel ad officialem nostrum recursus habeatur: salvâ nobis et successoribus nostris potestate addendi, detrahendi, corrigendi, mutandi vel minuendi in posterum sicut nobis et ipsis visum fuerit expedire. Data et acta anno Domini MCCLXXVI. apud Dunham in octavis beati Michaelis.\**

14. *Observations: University equivocal. The Officers thereof.*

Now seeing this is the most ancient composition in this kind we meet with, it will not be amiss to dwell a while thereon with our observations; the rather, because it mentioneth Cambridge, not as an University modernly modelled, but of an ancient constitution.

First. We find in the preface of this instrument the word "University," within the compass of three lines, used in two senses: 1. For "the generality of mankind," to whose notice this deed may attain: 2. For "scholars from all countries," studying the latitude of learning, in one grand society; in which acceptation (as formerly we have observed out of a great antiquary †) it began first to be used in the reign of king Henry III. Now, bishop Balsham termeth Cambridge *nostram*, "our," University: First. Because probably therein he had his education: Secondly. Because it was sited in (as surrounded with) his jurisdiction: Thirdly. Because lately, in the founding of Peter-House, it had largely tasted of his benefaction.

Secondly. Behold here the complete body of an University with the chancellor (at this present, Robert de Fulburne) the head, the regents and scholars the heart, the officers the hands and feet thereof. Of the latter this composition expresseth by name, 1. Beadles; and those two in number, with the verges or wands, since, in many years, grown up to be staves, and these two doubled into four at this day. Some conceive *bedellus* so called *quasi pedellus*, *a pedo*, signifying that ceremonious staff which they manage in their hands; whilst others with more probability derive it from "beads," ("prayers," in old English,) it being a principal part of his office to give public notice of all conventions for academical devotion. 2. *Scriptores*, "writers," well known to all. 3. *Illuminatores*, such as gave light and lustre to manuscripts, (whence our English "to limn,") by colouring and gilding the initial and capital letters therein,—essential ornaments in that age, men then being more

\* Extant in an old book of the archdeacons of Ely, now in the possession of my worthy friend, that judicious antiquary, Mr. More, late Fellow of Caius College, who, for me, kindly transcribed and faithfully compared it. † CAMDEN, in *Oxfordshire*, page 38.

pleased with babies in books than children are. 4. *Stationarii*, publicly avouching the sale of staple-books in standing shops, (whence they have their names,) as opposite to such circumforanean pedlars, (ancestors to our modern Mercuries and hawkers,) who secretly vend prohibited pamphlets. All other officers are included in this deed under the generical name of *mancipia*, whence our word "manciple" (confined since by custom to signify "the provider of victuals" for several colleges) takes its denomination.

15. *Query: What meant by "Magister Glomeriæ?"*

But what should be the sense of *glomerelli* and *magister glomeriæ*, (so often occurring in this instrument,) we must confess ourselves Seekers therein, as not satisfied with what learned Caius conjectureth therein. For he maketh him senior regent, to collect and count the suffrages in all congregations; \* as if so called a *glomerando*, from "going round about" the regent-house to that purpose; or from "gathering their votes," commonly written, and (to take up less room, and to be the better taken up) glomerated, that is, rolled and rounded up in a piece of paper. But elsewhere the same author tells us,† that our University-orator, at this day, succeeds to the ancient office of *magister glomeriæ*; whose place it is to entertain princes and peers coming thither, and to pen public letters on all occasions of importance. Whatever he was, it appears by this composition, that he kept courts, and had cognizance of causes of scholars under his jurisdiction. But seeing so great an antiquary as Sir Henry Spelman concludes all herein with a query,‡ (his doubts having more learning than other men's determinations,) let it suffice us to know, that the original of this word seems barbarous, his office narrow and topical, (confined to Cambridge,) and his certain use at this day antiquated and forgotten.

16. *The Bishop accused of Presumption herein.*

Now whereas this bishop, towards the close of this composition, thundereth forth his excommunication against the chancellor and whole University, if presuming to infringe the same in prejudice of his jurisdiction; some will conceive his presumption (or profaneness, rather) herein incurred, *ipso facto*, that heavy censure which he denounceth on others; considering the former privileges indulged some hundreds of years since, by several popes to this University.

HONORIUS I. *anno Domini* 624, *Feb. 20.*—*Auctoritate omnipotentis Dei, districtius inhibemus sub poenâ excommunicationis, quam*

\* *Hist. Cantab.* lib. ii. page 124.  
in G.

† *Idem*, page 129.

‡ See his "Glossary"

*veniens in contrarium ipso facto incurrat, ne quis archiepiscopus, episcopus, archidiaconus, aut eorum officiales seu visitatores generales, aut speciales, a sede apostolicâ deputati, audeat in aliquem academicum suspensionis vel excommunicationis seu interdicti sententias inferre. &c.\**

SERGIUS I. anno Domini 689, May 3.—*Præsentium auctoritate decrevimus, ut nulli archiepiscopo vel episcopo aliæ ecclesiasticæ personæ vel seculari liceat, Universitatem vestram, aut aliquem vestrum suspendere, seu excommunicare, vel quolibet sub interdicto ponere, absque summi pontificis assensu vel ejus speciali mandato, &c.†*

How durst the bishop of Ely, notwithstanding the premisses, interpose his power in University-matters? Is it not ridiculous for the man to pretend bounty in bestowing a remnant on him, to whom his master formerly had given the whole piece? What bounty was it in this bishop to exempt Cambridge partly from archidiaconal, which popes so long before had privileged from episcopal, jurisdiction?

17, 18. *Some over-harsh in their Censures. Moderation is best.*

These considerations have prevailed so far on the judgment of some (especially Oxford) men, that they condemn the credit of those ancient papal privileges indulged to Cambridge as false and forged. They conceive their censure herein advantaged by a discovery one hath made of a flaw in the Bull of Honorius, bearing date two years before Honorius was pope, whose papacy, according to common computation, began not until the year 626.‡

For mine own part, I see no necessity to cast away those papal Bulls as false and spurious, but rather conceive, that the originals of them were long since abolished at the destruction of Cambridge by the Danes, when all things were almost brought to a general desolation. And, although some copies and transcripts of them were reserved; yet, because such carried not authenticalness with them, the bishops of Ely, in after-ages, used (not to say, usurped) jurisdiction over Cambridge, whilst the University therein was as yet weak and poor, as scarcely recovered out of the late ruins thereof. Nor am I moved at the pretended detection of a false date in the Bull of Honorius, finding him at the same time sitting in the papal chair, by the testimony of authors of undeniable credit.§

\* See it exemplified at large in CAIUS, *De Antiq. Cantab.* lib. i. page 58.

† Expressed largely in the same author, page 60.

‡ *Antiq. Acad. Oxon.* page 62.

§ *Catalog. Augustin. De Nominibus Pontif. Roman.* MATTHEW WESTM. fol. 215. PLATINA, fol. 89.

‡ BRIAN TWYNE, *Apolog.*

19. *The ancient Hostels in Cambridge. A.D. 1280.*

It is now high time that we give-in a list of such Hostels in Cambridge, wherein students lived, under the rule of a Principal, on their own proper charges, before any Colleges were endowed in the University.

1. St. Augustine's-Hostel, now King's-College Pensionary, at the east end of the chapel, next to the Provost's lodging.\*

2. Bernard's-Hostel, situate where now the Master's garden of Bene't-College, but belonging to Queen's, as purchased by Andrew Ducket, (the last Principal,) and bestowed.†

3. Bolton's-place, now part of Pembroke-Hall.‡

4. Borden's-Hostel, near the back-gate of the Rose Tavern, opening against Caius-College; anciently it belonged to St. John's-Hostel, and afterwards to Clare-Hall.§

5. St. Botolph's-Hostel, betwixt the church and Pembroke-Hall, (where Wenham, a cook, dwelt in my time, and) where some collegiate character is still retained in the building.||

6. Clement's-Hostel, on the south of St. Clement's church.¶

7. Cousin's-Place, included in Pembroke-Hall.\*\*

8. St. Cross's-Hostel, in the street called School-lane, anciently a tenement of St. John's-Hospital.††

9. Edmond's-Hostel; *nomen patet, locus latet.*‡‡

10. St. Edward's-Hostel, against Little St. Mary's, where lately a victualling-house, called the Chopping-Knife.§§

11. Ely-Convent, near Borden's-Hostel, for Ely monks to study in.||||

12. Gerard's-Hostel, betwixt Trinity-Hall and College, where a bridge lately (if not still) bearing the name thereof.

13. God's-House, taken down by king Henry VI. but not in that sacrilegious sense wherein the Psalmist complains: "They have taken the houses of God into their possession," Psalm lxxxiii.

12. For when he took this into King's-College, in lieu thereof he founded another.¶¶

14. God's-House, now parcel of Christ's-College.\*\*\*

15. St. Gregory's-Hostel, where now Trinity-College Dove-coat.†††

16. Harlestone's-Hostel, in Harlestone's-lane, on the east of St. Clement's church. William Grey, bishop of Ely, 1466, allowed

\* CAIUS, *Hist. Cant. Acad.* lib. i. page 47.

† *Idem. ibid.*

‡ See J. SCOT'S

• "Tables."

§ *Sceletos Cantab. Joannis Parkeri, Caio. Gonvil.*

|| CAIUS.

¶ *Idem*, page 50.

\*\* SCOT'S "Tables."

†† *Sceletos Cant.*

‡‡ CAIUS,

page 51.

§§ *Sceletos Cant.*

|||| *Idem.*

¶¶ SCOT'S "Tables."

\*\*\* CAIUS.

††† *Sceletos Cant.*

them leave to officiate Divine Service in their oratory near the high bridge.\*

17. St. Hugh's-Hostel. This my worthy friend Mr. More, late Fellow of Caius-College, first descried out of an ancient manuscript, (once belonging to Ely,) attesting that Mr. —, of St. Hugh's-Hostel, was admitted to plead in the bishops' courts. Thus hath he recovered the denomination, let others discover the situation, thereof.

18. Jesus'-Hostel, or *de Pœnitentiâ Jesu*, and

19. St. John's-Hospital; for it is pity to part them, which stood close together, (as John usually lay in Jesus's bosom, John xiii. 23,) consisting of Seculars, and now both compounded into Peter-House.

20. St. John's-Hostel of Regulars, now translated into St. John's-College.

21. St. Catherine's-Hospital, now the south part of Trinity-College.†

22. Knapton's-Place, absorbed at this day in Pembroke-Hall.‡

23. St. Margaret's-Hostel, being the east side of Trinity-College.§

24. St. Mary's-Hostel, on the north-west of that church, where only a brick-wall keeps possession of the memory thereof. It belongeth to Bene't; Matthew Parker being first admitted here, before transplanted into that College.||

25. St. Nicholas's-Hostel, over-against Christ-College, where now a private house, with the public name of the Brasen-George. The scholars hereof, as eminent for hard studying, so infamous for their brawlings by night.¶

26. Ovings'-Inn, the buildings under which the kennel betwixt Caius and Trinity-College emptieth itself.\*\*

27. St. Paul's-Inn, now the Rose Tavern.††

28. Phiswick's-Hostel, bequeathed by William Phiswick, esquire-beadle to Gonville-Hall,—since taken into Trinity-College.‡‡

29. Pythagoras's-House, beyond the bridge; either so called, because his philosophy was studied there, or because formerly the form or building thereof resembled a Y, his beloved letter. Otherwise, many men will be made as soon to believe Pythagoras's transmigration of souls, as the transportation of his body hither,—that he ever lived in Britannia. It now belongeth to Merton-College in Oxford.§§

30. Rud's-Hostel, over against Emmanuel-College, where now the Castle-Inn.||||

\* *Sceletos Cant.*

† *Idem.*

‡ SCOT'S "Tables."

§ *Sceletos Cant.*

|| CAIUS, *ut prius*, page 2.

¶ *Idem*, page 50.

\*\* *Sceletos Cantab.*

†† CAIUS.

‡‡ *Sceletos Cantab.*

§§ *Idem.*

|||| *Idem.*

31. St. Thomas's-Hostel, where now the orchard of the Master of Pembroke-Hall, and where the neighbouring Leas retain their name : formerly the *Campus Martius* of the scholars here exercising themselves, sometimes too violently ; lately disused, either because young scholars now have less valour, or more civility.\*

32. Trinity-Hostel, on the south side of that church, the habitation lately of Dr. Angier, now of Dr. Eade. Some chapel-conformity is still extant in an east window thereof : and the ancient arms of the earl of Oxford in an outward room, invite me to believe that family the founder thereof.

33. Tiled-Hostel, on the west of Caius and east of Trinity-College.

34. University-Hostel, which in the year 1350 was, for some considerations, passed, by the Vice-Chancellor and Regent-house, to Pembroke-Hall. This anciently was the house of Sir Roger Haidon, knight ; and long before, one Fabian, the Chaplain, dwelt therein.

Of these Hostels we see some denominated from the saint to whom they were dedicated, as St. Margaret's, St. Nicholas's, &c. Some from the vicinage of the church to which they were adjoined, as St. Mary's, St. Botolph's, &c. Some from the materials with which they were covered, as Tiled-Hostel. Some from those who formerly bought, built, or possessed them, as Borden's, Rud's, Phiswick's, &c. Some were reserved only for civil and canon lawyers, as St. Paul's, Ovings', Trinity, St. Nicholas's, Borden's, St. Edward's, and Rud's ; and all the rest employed for artists and divines. Some of them were but members and appendants to other Hostels, (and afterwards to Colleges,) as Borden's to St. John's-Hostel, then to Clare-Hall ; St. Bernard's to Queen's. The rest were absolute corporations, entire within themselves, without any subordination.

## 20. *Inns less than Hostels.*

Know also that Inns (whereof only two, Ovings' and St. Paul's) differed only gradually from Hostels, as being less. For John Ovings, clerk, bought the ground whereon this Inn, from him named, was seated, of the first prioress of St. Radigund's, for two shillings ; which, at twelve years' purchase, was but two pence a-year. It seems, being a waste, it was little worth ; or else the prioress charitably afforded him the better pennyworth, in consideration that he would improve the place to a public good.

21, 22. *Two hundred Halls said to be in Oxford. Magnitude supplies Multitude.*

But here the Oxford antiquary insulteth on the paucity of ancient Hostels, in Cambridge, (which all our industry cannot advance to forty,) much boasting of the numerousness of the Halls in Oxford, which he mounteth to above two hundred, assigning their several names and situations, besides entries, chambers, and other less places for students to live in.

I envy not my aunt's fruitfulness, (though every hundred had been a thousand,) but conceive such Halls must needs be mean and small structures, if we consult the content and extent of Oxford, not exceeding Cambridge in greatness of ground, and the latter every whit as εὐπηγής, or "well-compacted together." Either then such Halls (like flowers that grow double) must one crowd into another; or else they must be inconsiderably small, like those three hundred sixty-five children which Margaret countess of Henneberg brought forth at a birth in Holland,—one skull whereof I have seen,\* no bigger than a bead or a bean; or else it is utterly impossible such a compass of ground should contain them. Besides, "if all the body be the eye, where then is the hearing?" These two hundred Halls for scholars will take up so much ground, none will be left for the townsmen. This makes me conceive, that *aula* (whence our "Hall") did import but one fair room, or else was a townsman's house, (like Moody-Hall in Cambridge,) where scholars dined together. This I dare aver, that what the Halls in Cambridge wanted of Oxford in number, they had in greatness; so that what was lost in discrete—was found in continued—quantity. For we read how in the Hostels of St. Mary, Bernard, Thomas, Augustine, there were twelve, twenty, and sometimes thirty regents, besides non-regents above them, and young students beneath them. As for the Hostels designed for lawyers, almost every of them had fourscore or an hundred students. So that what Homer saith of a physician, that he is πολλῶν ἀντάξιός ἄλλων, "eminently worth many others:" one of Cambridge-Hostels might be equivalent, in number of students, to many of those Oxford-Halls; and the difference not so great in scholars, as the disproportion betwixt thirty of the one and two hundred of the other doth seem to import.

\* Derived for some hundred of years by succession, through authentic physicians, to Dr. Vilvain of Exeter, present owner thereof, and avouched, by the skilful in anatomy, the true head of an infant once born into the world.



23, 24. *The Benefit and Use of Hostels. A Catalogue of learned Cambridge Hostellers.*

In these Hostels Scholars were more conveniently accommodated than in townsmen's houses, wherein anciently they lived; both because here they were united under one head; and because they were either rent-free, or paid it by agreement to a chief of their own Society. But as stars lose their light when the sun ariseth; so all these Hostels decayed by degrees, when endowed Colleges began to appear in Cambridge; and I behold Trinity-Hostel (wherein Students continued till the year 1540) as the longest liver, surviving all the rest.

But, whilst they were in use, many worthy scholars were bred therein; and pity it is the catalogue of their names is lost. For when I find an English bishop, or learned writer, brought up in Cambridge, but not reducible, with probability, to any College now in being, presently I conclude he had his education in one of the aforesaid Hostels. I will instance only in those which flourished in the reign of king Henry VIII.

Henry Holbeach, bishop of Lincoln, 1547; John Capon, bishop of Sarum, 1539; John Hilsey, bishop of Rochester, 1536; William Repps, bishop of Norwich, 1536; Thomas Thyrleby, bishop of Norwich, 1550; James Stanley, bishop of Ely, 1506; Rowland Lee, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, 1524; Richard Sampson, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, 1543; John Clerk, bishop of Bath and Wells, 1523; Edward Vaughan, bishop of St. David's, 1509; Edmund Birkhead, bishop of St. Asaph, 1513; Henry Standish, bishop of St. Asaph, 1519; Robert Parfew,\* bishop of St. Asaph, 1536; John Bird, bishop of Bangor, 1539; Robert Holgate, archbishop of York, 1544; Cuthbert Tunstall, bishop of Durham, 1530.

All these undoubtedly were and are allowed by bishop Godwin to be Cambridge-men, yet no modern College-register can reach them, as to lay just claim to their breeding. Whence we infer them to be no Collegiates, but Hostellers, not in that sense which the spiteful papists charged Dr. Cranmer to be one,† (“an attendant on a stable,”) but “such as lived in a learned Inn or Hostel not endowed with revenues.”

25. *Ancient religious Houses in Cambridge.*

Pass we now from these Hostels to those religious houses which anciently flourished in Cambridge: where first we meet with the

\* According to Le Neve, Robert Warton was the bishop at that time.—EDIT.

† Fox's “Acts and Monuments.”



Dominicans, or Preaching Friars, (though neither finding their founder, nor valuation at their suppression,) whose house is now turned into Emmanuel-College.

Franciscans follow, called also Minors, or Gray Friars; their house being now converted into Sidney College. It was founded by king Edward I. where they had a fair church, which I may call "the St. Mary's," before "St. Mary's;" the Commencement, Acts, and Exercises being kept therein. The area of this church is easily visible in Sidney College garden, where the depression and subsidency of their bowling-green east and west present the dimensions thereof, and I have oft found dead men's bones thereabouts. When this church fell, or was taken down, I know not; and should be thankful to such as should to me expound those passages in Mr. Ascham's epistle to Thomas Thyrleby, bishop of Westminster; the date of the year not being expressed. It is to entreat him to stand the University's friend, in compassing for them this house of Franciscans, wherein hitherto their great endeavours had small success; adding moreover, *Franciscanorum ædes non modò decus atque ornamentum academix, sed opportunitates magnas ad comitia, et omnia academix negotia conficienda habent*. What accommodations this house could then afford the University at Commencement I understand not. Sure I am, king Henry VIII. bestowed it on Trinity College, of whom the executors of the lady Frances Sidney did afterwards purchase it.

Augustine Friars, on the south side of Pease-Market, lately the dwelling of Mr. Pierce, and now of Mr. Thomas Buck, esquire-beadle. Their founder and value unknown.

Carmelites, built by Edward I. to which Sir Guy de Mortimer and Thomas de Hertford were great benefactors. Their house crossed athwart the street now leading to King's College, as occupying the ground whereon Catherine Hall and Queen's do stand at this day.

White Canons, almost over-against Peter House, where now a brick-wall, (the back-side is called White Canons at this day,) and an inn with the sign of the Moon.

As for the nunnery of St. Radigund's and priory of Barnwell, we have formerly spoken of them: only I add, that at the Dissolution king Henry bestowed the site of the latter on Sir Anthony Brown (afterward viscount Mountague) and dame Elizabeth his wife, and their heirs, at the rent of one pound four shillings penny half-penny.

## 26. *Frequent Contests betwixt Friars and University-Men.*

These Friars living in these convents were capable of degrees, and kept their Acts, as other University-men. Yet were they gremials and not-gremials, who sometimes would so stand on the tiptoes of their privileges, that they endeavoured to be higher than other students: so that oftentimes they and the scholars could not set their horses in one stable, or rather their books on one shelf. However, generally the Chancellors ordered them into tolerable obedience, as will appear hereafter.

## 27. *A List of learned Friars, Writers. A.D. 1282.*

Last of all, it will be enough for the present, to give in a list of such learned writers as were bred in Cambridge, in these several Orders, as we have collected them out of Bale, Pits, and other authors.

**AUGUSTINIANS.**—Gulielmus Wels, 1421; Joannes Buriensis, 1460; Galfride Glandfield, 1340; Joannes Godwick, 1360; John Langham, —; John Sloley, 1477; John Tonney, 1490; Ralph Marcham, 1380; Richard Chester, 1354; Roger Clacton, 1340.

**DOMINICANS.**—William Encurt, 1340; William Kingsham, 1262; John Boltesham, 1388; John Bromiard, 1390; John Stock, 1374; Simon Barnstone, 1337; Tho. Langford, 1320.

**FRANCISCANS.**—Will. Folvil, 1384; John Wichingham, 1362; Reginald Langham, 1410; Vin. Coventriensis, 1251; Stephen Baron, 1520.

**CARMELITES.**—Alan. de Lin, 1420; Dionys. Holcan, 1424; Walter Diss, 1404; Walter Heston, 1350; Will. Beccle, 1438; Will. Bintree, 1493; Will. Blacvey, 1490; Will. Califord, —; Will. Cokisford, 1380; Will. de Sanctâ Fide, 1372; Will. Greene, 1470; Will. Harsick, 1413; Will. Lincoln, 1360; Will. Sarslet, 1466; Will. Parcher, 1470; Hugh of St. Neot's, 1340; Joh. Bampto, 1341.; Jo. Baret, 1556; Jo. Beston, 1428; Jo. Clipston, 1378; Jo. Elin, 1379; Jo. Falsham, 1348; Jo. Hornby, 1374; Jo. Pascal, 1361; Jo. Repingal, 1350; Jo. Swaffam, 1394; Jo. Thorpe, 1440; Jo. Tilney, 1430; Jo. Wamsleet, 1418; Mart. Sculthorp, 1430; Nic. Cantilupe, 1441; Nic. Kenton, 1468; Nic. Swaffam, 1449; Pet. de Sanctâ Fide, 1452; Ralph Spalding, 1390; Rob. Ivorie, 1392; Tho. Hilley, 1290; Tho. Maldon, 1404.

These were bred in the aforesaid houses in Cambridge, belonging to their Orders, until graduated in Divinity, and were afterwards dispersed into their respective convents, all over England.

28. *The first Endowing of Peter-House. Zoars may grow great in Time.*

The reader doth remember how, above twenty years since, (namely, *anno* 1257,) Hugh Balsham, sub-prior of Ely, founded a College without Trumpington-gate, consisting of two Hostels he had purchased and united. The same Hugh, now bishop of Ely, removed the Secular Brethren from St. John's Hospital, in the Jewry,\* (where they and the Regulars agreed not very well,) to this his new foundation. At which time he endowed the same with maintenance for one Master, fourteen Fellows, two Bible-Clerks, and eight poor Scholars; whose number might be increased or diminished, according to the improvement or abatement of their revenues. He appointed his successors, the bishops of Ely, to be honorary patrons, yea, nursing fathers, to this his infant College; who have well discharged their trust therein.

We know what the historian saith: *Omnia fermè principia sunt parva*, "Almost all beginnings are small;" as here indeed they were. Alas! Balsham, for a long time, was little able to endow a College, as scarce sufficient to subsist of himself; whilst his election to Ely (made without the king's consent) was not yet confirmed.† But no sooner had he any certainty for himself but his College had a share thereof; for he gave them all the rights and tithes belonging to St. Peter's church, adjoining, and by his will bequeathed them three hundred marks, wherewith was bought and built a fair Hall and court, since much beautified and enlarged.

MASTERS.—1. Roger de la Goter, of St. Botolph's, Master, A. D. 1340. 2. Ralph de Holbeche resigned his place, and resumed a Fellowship, 1349. 3. William de Whittlesey, arch-deacon of Huntingdon, chosen *custos*, 1349. 4. Richard de Wisbich, chosen Master, 1351. 5. Thomas de Wormehall, canon of Sarum, chancellor of Ely, 1381. He died the same year. 6. John de Newton, chosen, 1381. 7. Thomas de Castro Bernardi, 1400. 8. John Holbrook. He died, 1431. 9. Thomas Lane, 1457. 10. Thomas Deinman, 1500. 11. John Warkworth, 1474. 12. Henry Hornby, —. 13. Jo. Edmunds, 1552. 14. Ralph Ainsworth, 1553. 15. Andrew Perne, 1553. 16. Robert Soame, 1589. 17. Jo. Richardson, 1608. 18. Tho. Turner, 1615. 19. Leonard Maw, 1617. 20. Matthew Wren, 1625, 21. John Cosins, dean of Peterborough, 1634. 22. Lazarus Seaman, D.D. 1644.‡

\* Botwixt Round Church and (what is now) St. John's College.


† Godwin in his "Catalogue of Bishops."

‡ Le Neve gives a list of twenty-six Masters, between A. D. 1290 and 1644. Some of the names in the two lists, as usual, vary a little in orthography.—EDIT.

VIEWS OF COLLEGES AND HALLS



PETERHOUSE



CHAPEL



INNER QUAD



OUTER QUAD



INNER QUAD



INNER QUAD



INNER QUAD



INNER QUAD



**BENEFACTORS.**—Simon Montacute, Simon Langham, and John Fordham, bishops of Ely. John Holbrook, Thomas Lane, Thomas Deyman, John Warkworth, Will. Burgoin, Henry Hornbye, John Edmunds, Andrew Perne, all Masters of the College. Ralph Walpool, bishop of Norwich, 1290, gave two messuages in Cambridge. Mr. Thomas Packington. William Noyon, rector of Haddenham. William Martin. Robert Shorton. Edmund Hanson. Robert Gilbert. Mr. Skelton. Mrs. Elizabeth Wolfe. John Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury. Edward Lord North. Robert Smith. Henry Wilshaw. The Lady Mary Ramsey. Robert Warden. Thomas Warren. Mrs. Margaret Dean. William Herne. Mr. Robert Slade. Mr. John Blith, late Fellow. Mrs. Frances Matthew, who gave £200, Dr. John Richardson, who gave £100, and Dr. Haukings, who gave £100, towards the building of a new court, front, and gate towards the street, now finished.

**BISHOPS.**—William de Whittlesey, third Master of this College, archbishop of Canterbury.\* John de Bottelsham, bishop of Rochester, Master of this College. John Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, Fellow. Walter Curle, bishop of Winchester, Fellow. Matthew Wren, Master of this College, bishop of Ely.

**LEARNED WRITERS.**—Roger Marshal, well skilled in mathematics; whereof, saith Pits, in his Appendix, he wrote many books, and collected more, which he gave to the library. George Joye, who flourished *anno* 1547, translated part of the Bible.† Edward Simmons, who wrote many good treatises, 1547.

**LIVINGS IN THE COLLEGE GIFT.**—1. Cherry-Hinton vicarage, in Ely diocess, valued in the king's books at £9. 14s. 6d. 2. Ellington, in the diocess of Lincoln, a vicarage, valued at £6. 9s. 3. Thriplow vicarage, in Ely diocess, valued £9. 4s. 2d. 4. St. Mary's-the-Less, in Cambridge, valued ——. 5. Statherne rectory, in Lincoln diocess, valued £16. 3s.‡

The reader will pardon the shortness of this our catalogue of Masters, (not touching the top of the foundation by fifty years,) which looks like the blunt tower of a steeple, whose spire or shaft hath been burnt down with lightning, or broken with thunder; as, indeed, some such casualty hath caused this imperfection. For, in

\* So Mr. R. Parker proves him out of the Records of Ely; though otherwise, I confess, bishop Godwin makes him of Oxford. † BALE, *Cent. nona*, page 721.

‡ At the close of this Section, (page 67,) and of each subsequent one in the "History," will be inserted, in the form of copious notes, additional particulars respecting the learned foundations described in them, and the eminent men who have flourished since Fuller's days, and who have shed a lustre on the Colleges in which they severally received their education, and the University in which they obtained literary distinction. —EDIT.

the year 1420, a sad fire consumed the muniments of this College ; which caused Caius to begin his list of Masters but at Thomas de Castro Bernardi ; and the six Seniors before him are recovered, by the care of Mr. R. Parker,\* out of Ely Records. Yet this catalogue still remaineth incomplete, (O that it were as easy to rectify as to reprove faults !) guilty, I am afraid, not only of transposition in the order, but omission in the number, thereof. For I have read, that John Bottelsham was admitted Master 14— ; † yet he appears not in Caius, or any other printed author.

29. *A general Rule about our Catalogue of Benefactors.*

Amongst the Benefactors, many, who only gave plate, small sums, and books, are, for brevity's sake, omitted ; and not any slighting of their bounty for the smallness thereof. For if our Saviour beheld the widow as the best benefactor to the *corban*, who endowed it only with “two mites ;” and if “a cup of cold water” (warm comfort to a thirsty soul) shall receive its reward ; surely, such as give the cup, also, deserve their due commendation, and shall have a requital thereof. I have ordered some black lines at the end of that catalogue, as a reserve to register the bounty of posterity, which shall not complain that they are paper-bound in my book, where room on purpose is left to enter their names who shall be charitably disposed. I hope also, that those void intervals and spaces in the list of learned writers (which as so many open mouths invoke the industry of the reader) will have their emptiness filled by several men's observations, whose pens may at their leisure supply what the press hath left unperfect.

30, 31. *Cautela non nocet. Repetition of Bishops, why necessary.*

Know also I could have more particularly specified the value and place of Founders' and Benefactors' bounty,—what land they gave, how much worth, where lying ; but thought better to forbear, as ignorant, in these dangerous days, what ill use might be made of my well-intended endeavours.

Condemn not our tautology, if the same bishop often recur in several Colleges ; perchance, Scholar of one, Fellow of another, Master of a third : because rather than I would wrong any House with the omission, I would right them all with the repetition of the same person. Such bishops as passed through many sees successively are, for shortness, entitled only from the last and highest dignity.

\* In his *Sceletos Cantabrigiensis*, MS.

† Manuscript in 10.

32. *A commendable Custom of this College.*

To return to Peter House : I cannot but commend one peculiar practice of this College, which in their parlour preserveth the pictures of all their principal Benefactors.\* For, although the bounty of the judicious is grounded on more solid motives, than to be flattered thereinto by the fancy that their effigies shall be kept ; yet such an ingenuous memorial may be an encouragement to a patron's liberality. Besides, under such pictures a distich commonly is written, and I will instance in one of the latest date :—

*Hæredem voluit SLADUS conscribere PETRUM,  
Clauderet extremum ne sine prole diem.*

“ SLADE, Peter chose, and for his heir assign'd him,  
Lest he should die, and leave no child behind him.”

At this day the College maintaineth one Master, nineteen Fellows, twenty-nine Bible-Clerks, eight poor Scholars, beside other Officers and Students amounting lately (namely, *anno* 1634) to a hundred and six.

33—35. *The eldest English-endowed College. Exception to the Contrary answered. The Truth unpartially stated.*

We Cambridge-men behold this College as the first foundation endowed in England, which our cor-rivals at Oxford will not allow. For I find it inscribed in Rochester church, on the monument of Walter de Merton, that the College by him founded and named is the example of all in that kind. Mr. Camden, in his description of Oxford, affirmeth, that Balliol and Merton Colleges therein are “the two first endowed for Students in Christendom.”† And some allege that Merton College must needs be the mother, and Peter-House but the daughter, because Simon de Montacute, bishop of Ely, did prescribe the statutes of Merton to be observed by the Students of Peter House.

All this scarce moveth—nothing removeth—us from our former opinion ; being almost as confident of the seniority of Peter House before all other Colleges, as Romanists are of the priority of St. Peter before the rest of the apostles. And, first, as for the inscription in Rochester, both it and Merton's monument are modern, as set up by Sir Henry Savile, *anno* 1598. That passage of the great antiquary is only extant in the English translation, not Latin *Britannia* ; and so may justly seem to have more of Philemon Holland, than William Camden therein. It is confessed that

\* “These paintings,” says Wilson, in his *Memorabilia*, “are on the panels of the wainscoting of the Combination-room.” “They are now removed to the library. The mottoes under the portraits of Edward I. and Balsham were neat and appropriate enough.” *DYER'S History*.—EDIT.

† *Britannia*, page 381.



Simon Montacute, the seventeenth bishop of Ely, more than sixty years after Balsham's death, enjoined our Petreans the observation of Merton-College statutes, finding them more convenient than such which their Founder had left them. But this makes nothing to the matter of most antiquity, the point in controversy. In requital of this courtesy, if Cambridge hath ought the imitation whereof may be acceptable to Oxford, she is right glad for the welcome occasion; as, lately, Oxford, in choice of her Proctors, hath conformed herself to Cambridge-custom, by way of a circular combination of Colleges, as a course most quiet, and freest from faction.

The crisis of the controversy depends, if I mistake not, on the clearing of the different dates of the foundation of Peter House, and comparing it with others.

PETER HOUSE first founded, A.D. 1257, the forty-first of Henry III. by sub-prior Hugh Balsham.

PETER HOUSE first endowed, A.D. 1282, the eleventh of Edward I. by Hugh Balsham, bishop of Ely.

BALLIOL first founded and endowed, A.D. 1262, the forty-sixth of Henry III. by John Balliol.

MERTON COLLEGE first founded and endowed, A.D. 1274, the second of Edward I. by Walter Merton, bishop of Rochester.

The impartial result is this, Peter House was founded before any, but endowed (by the same founder) after two Colleges in Oxford. Yet because, in such doubtful casts, it is good reason Cambridge should measure to her own most advantage; we may safely say that Peter House is the first College endowed, though not the first-endowed College, in England, and, by consequence, in Christendom.\*

36. *Three Places for the Petreans' Devotions. [Succession of Chancellors. Brawl betwixt University-men and Friars. Bull of Pope John XXI. to the University. 12 Edward II. A.D. 1283—1319.]*

The Students of Peter House performed their Divine service, since their first foundation, in three several places; namely,

1. In St. Peter's church, adjoining, which fell down to the ground about the year 1350.

2. In the church of *Beata Maria de Gratiâ*, commonly called Little St. Mary's; whence the College also is so called and written for some hundreds of years, hardly recovering its own name.

3. In a beautiful new chapel, consecrated March 17th, anno

\* See note at the end of this Section, page 70.

1632. A thousand pounds were spent in the building thereof, and the contributors' names affixed in a catalogue therein.

Hitherto we have had but a desultory and uncertain succession of Chancellors, but henceforward we may presume on more assurance herein.

Andrew de Gisleham, Chancellor ; a benefactor to the University. A. D. 1283.

Thomas Shermingham, Chancellor. He defended the rights of the University against the prior of Barnwell. 1286.

Stephanus de Hepworth, Chancellor. 1287.

Ralph de Leicester, Chancellor. No good blood betwixt him and the University about the distinction of seats. 1289.

Galfridus de Pakenham, Chancellor. He first paved the town ; towards the doing whereof, king Edward granted him to take the toll of Cambridge for six years. 1290.

The church of St. Mary's was this year (A. D. 1291) much defaced with fire. At what time the Jews (whom I will not accuse as the causers thereof) were forced to forsake the town, where they had a great synagogue.

Henry de Boyton, Chancellor. He stoutly defended the right of the University for thirty acres of ground and four messuages in Cambridge, which Roger de Beddingfield gave for ever to the Master and Scholars, to defend their state and privileges.\* 1293.

The king came this year (A. D. 1294) to Cambridge, and lodged two days in the castle.

It was ordered that the Chancellor should not imprison or banish any regent without the consent of the Regent-house, nor should he omit the same, if they so appointed it.

A contest betwixt the Chancellor and the other doctors is compounded before the official of the bishop of Ely.

John de Bradenham, Chancellor, A. D. 1295.

Thomas de Sheringham, Chancellor, 1296.

Stephen de Hepworth, Chancellor, 1299.

Stephen de Haselfield, Chancellor, 1300.

The king granted, by his charter, that Scholars might summon townsmen to appear before the Chancellor, in any personal actions.

A brawl began betwixt the University-men on the one side, the Dominicans and Franciscans on the other. This increased from words to violence ; and Stephen the Chancellor, as a valiant champion, thundered his excommunications both general and special (whereby his episcopal power plainly appeareth) against the Friars ; yea, two of the most active of them, Nicholas de Dale and Adam

\* *Manuscript, M. W.*

de Hoddon, seem to be expelled the University. Hereupon the friars appeal to the pope of Rome, and both parties appointed their Proctors to solicit their suit :—

FOR THE UNIVERSITY.—Stephen de Segrave, Thomas Kyningham.

FOR THE DOMINICANS.—John de Westerfield, Peter de Ruda.

FOR THE FRANCISCANS.—Richard Lisle, John of Ipswich.

But, taking wit in their way, considering the costliness of that court, and the long journey thither, they remitted the matter, at Bourdeaux, to Thomas, cardinal of St. Sabine, who accorded them on the following conditions :—\*

1. That the Chancellor of Cambridge should retract his excommunications in the same place wherein they were denounced.

2. That no act of the Regent-house should extend to derogate from the rights of the Friars.

3. That though by the statutes of the University only the Chancellor, or some by him assigned, were to preach on the first Advent, Septuagesima, and Ash-Wednesday; yet, nevertheless the Friars might freely preach the same days and hours in their own convents.

4. That Friar Nicholas de Dale and Adam de Hoddon, if pleased to re-assume their places in the University, should quietly be admitted, and should have their remedy against such who had offered violence unto them, as in such cases is usual against the disturbers of the peace.

5. That whereas all Bachelors Inceptors in Divinity are bound by the statutes to preach *ad Clerum* in St Mary's; the aforesaid Friars might preach such sermons in their own convents, first acquainting the Chancellor with the day they chose for the same.

Some conceive this was a drawn battle betwixt them; whilst others apprehend, that the Friars, finding the most favour, came off conquerors, as keeping the field, and making good their ground in this contention.

Stephen de Segrave, Chancellor; in whose absence, Richard de Ashton was his substitute. A.D. 1306.

Stephen de Haselfield, Chancellor, 1307.

Richard de Ashton, Chancellor, 1315.

John XXI.† pope of Rome, at the request of king Edward II. granted the ensuing Bull to the University; which the reader is requested seriously to peruse; the sense whereof is the subject of some difference betwixt us and Oxford.

*Joannes episcopus, servus servorum Dei, dilectis filiis Universi-*

\* HARE, vol. i. fol. 29, 30.  
1316."—EDIT.

† Bellarmine says, "*Johannes XXI. dictus XXII.*

*tatis Cantabrigiæ Eliensis diocesis, salutem, et apostolicam benedictionem.—Inter singula, quæ gratâ nos oblectatione lætificant, grandi cor nostrum reficitur gaudio, et lætitiâ exultat exoptatâ, cum eos qui cœlesti sunt providentiâ præditi, ad populorum regimen et regnorum, ad communem subjectorum suorum profectum intentos aspicimus, ipsosque ad publicæ utilitatis bonum sollicitos intuemur : sanè charissimus in Christo filius noster, Edwardus rex Angliæ [illustris] prudenter attendens, quòd multitudo sapientum salus est regnorum, quòdque non minùs prudentium consilio, quàm fortium strenuitate virorum, regentium et regnorum moderamina disponantur, apud Cantabrigiam, Eliensis diocesis locum, in regno suo multis commoditatibus præditum, et insignem desiderat vigere studium generale, et quod a doctoribus et docendis in posterum frequentetur, humiliter postulatit a nobis ut studium ab olim ibi ordinatum, et privilegia a Romanis pontificibus prædecessoribus nostris vel regibus [Angliæ] qui fuerint pro tempore eidem concessa, apostolico curemus munimine roborare. Nos igitur suæ intentionis propositum, dignis in Domino laudibus commendantes, ejusque supplicationibus inclinati, apostolicâ autoritate statuimus, ut in prædicto loco Cantabrigiæ sit de cætero studium generale [illudque ibidem vigeat perpetuis futuris temporibus in quâlibet facultate]: volentes autoritate prædictâ et etiam decernentes, quòd collegium magistrorum et scholarium ejusdem studii, Universitas sit censenda, et omnibus juribus gaudeat, quibus gaudere potest et debet Universitas quæcunque legitimè ordinata. Cæterùm omnia privilegia et indulta prædicto studio, rationabiliter a pontificibus et regibus prædictis concessa, autoritate prædictâ confirmamus. Nulli igitur omninò liceat hanc paginam nostri statuti, voluntatis, constitutionis, et confirmationis infringere, vel ausu temerario contraire: si quis autem hoc attemptare præsumpserit, indignationem Omnipotentis Dei, et beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum, noverit se incursurum. Dat. Arinionæ 5 Idûs Julii, pontificatus nostri anno secundo.\**

This year, (1319,) according to the computation of Helvicus, falls out to be the year of our Lord 1317, and the eleventh of the reign of king Edward II. though, to gratify the Oxford antiquary, we have here followed his account in our marginal chronology.

**37. A necessary Caution.** *Studium and Universitas the same in Effect. A.D. 1319.*

Now, let none conceive Cambridge (long since the mother of many children) now but new-born, herself an University from the date of this papal instrument. A mistake of many, alleging, for

\* A few of the principal variations which occur between this copy and Dyer's transcript of this Bull, I have here enclosed within crotchets.—EDIT.

the defence of their error, that otherwise it were ridiculous for our king to request, and the pope to confer, on Cambridge, what she had already; adding moreover, that the phrase *de cætero*, “for the time to come,” implieth, that *de præterito*, “for the time past,” Cambridge was no University. But let such know, that in this Bull Cambridge is confessed a place for students time out of mind, or (to use the pope’s Latin) *ab olim*; where *olim* (a word of indefinite extent) is not made the measure of the antiquity of Cambridge, but (which is more) is only the *terminus a quo* whence her duration in her learned capacity is dated. This Bull also relateth to ancient privileges of popes and princes, bestowed upon her; which herein are roborated and confirmed.\*

Know also that *Studium* and *Universitas* are synonymes, though the latter the more fashionable word in this age.† Nor is it any news for popes officiously to court kings for their own ends, with cheap courtesies, by granting what in effect was given before, and varnishing over their predecessors’ old acts with new specious expressions. We have plainly proved, out of plentiful records in the Tower, Cambridge called an University in the king’s charters more than seventy years before, and so no doubt before the Conquest; though that her title, in the troublesome times of war, had been disturbed and interrupted. As therefore the seniority of scholars, who have long discontinued, is justly reckoned, not from their return to the College, but from their first admission therein; so the Universityship of Cambridge is to be accounted from her original constitution, not this her late confirmation.

### 38. *A facile Mistake.*

Nor are we much moved with what is alleged in this point out of Robert Remington; and take the words as Twyne the

\* Dyer, when quoting this paragraph with approbation, says, “There is no room to doubt the authenticity of this Bull; and I shall go further, and introduce the following flourishing testimony of Dr. Fuller.”—EDIT. † After citing this sentence, Dyer thus reasons on it:—“Now, admitting that the word *Studium* may be sometimes the same as *Studium generale*, and synonymous with ‘University;’ as, for instance, *Studium Parisiense*, for ‘the University of Paris,’ in an instrument of this John’s, quoted by Twyne, and *Studium Bononiæ*, quoted by Dufrêne, for ‘the University of Bononia;’ still this is not necessarily its meaning, and it may be interpreted, ‘any place for study in general:’ and the order preserved in the present Bull seems to require that distinction here. It had been a *Studium* for learned men; the pope confirms this *Studium*, and further authorizes it in future to be a *Generale Studium*. This interpretation, if admitted, will, without the arguments just advanced, invalidate the authenticity of the former Bulls. It would show, that, whatever privileges other popes or kings granted to this learned body, to which pope John alludes in this Bull, still it wanted that peculiar grant of pontifical authority which would bind it more immediately to his interest, by that magical talisman of a word—‘University;’ and, subsequently, that the former Bulls, [those of Honorius and Sergius,] in which that word occurs, are fabrications, and no genuine instruments.”—EDIT.

Oxford antiquary doth manage them the most for his own advantage :— \*

*Regnante Edwardo primo (secundo diceret) de Studio Grantbridge facta est Universitas, sicut est Oxonium, per curiam Romanam*: “In the reign of Edward the first (he should have said Edward the second) Cambridge was made an University, even as Oxford, by the court of Rome.”

See we here Remington mistakes, even by his confession who citeth him in his own behalf. Now, he who faults in one thing may even fail in another. He that mistook Edward the first for Edward the second may, by as easy an error, mistake *facta* for *refecta*, the “institution” for the “restitution” of Cambridge.

Roger de Northburge, Chancellor. He obtained licence from the king, that the University might purchase advowsons of spiritual livings, to the value of forty pounds *per annum*.† Indeed, king Edward was courteous to Cambridge, wherein he maintained thirty-two scholars on his own cost; intending to build King’s Hall, which his son and successor did perform. A.D. 1321.

### 39. *Michael House founded by Herveus Stanton. A.D. 1324.*

Herveus (falsely in some copies Henricus) de Stanton, clerk, canon of York and Wells, rector of East Dereham and North Creik in Norfolk, Chancellor of the Exchequer to king Edward II. flourished now in great wealth and esteem. Let none envy him his pluralities, who so well employed the profits thereof, and this year founded a College, following the example of Hugh de Balsam, but dedicating it to St. Michael, the chief of angels; as the other had consecrated his to St. Peter, the prime of apostles.

MASTERS.—1. Roger Burton, B.D. 2. Mr. Robs, *aliàs* Roob. 3. Mr. Thomas Kenningham. 4. Mr John Rympham. 5. Mr. Richard Langley. 6. Mr. William Gotham. 7. Mr. William Colvill. 8. Mr. Henry Cranby. 9. Mr John Otteringham. 10. Mr. Willam Ayscough. 11. Edward Story. 12. John Yotton. 13. John Foothead. 14. Tho. Slackhouse. 15. Nichol Willan. 16. Francis Mallet, chaplain to queen Mary.

BENEFACTORS.—1. Alexander Walsham, knight, heir to Hervey the Founder. 2. Walter de Waney. 3. John Ilvey, knight, a grand benefactor. 4. William Gotham. 5. John Turke. 6. Henry Craby.

BISHOPS.—1. William Ayscough, bishop of Salisbury. 2. Edward Story, bishop of Chichester. 3. John Fisher, bishop of Rochester.‡

\* *Ant. Acad. Oxford Apol.* lib. i. page 110.  
more hereof in our “History,” anno 1535, vol. ii. pp. 59—64.

† *Manuscript M. W.*

‡ See

LEARNED WRITER.—John Fisher.

LIVINGS IN THE COLLEGE GIFT.—1. Barrington vicarage, in Ely diocess, valued £7. 14s. 4d. 2. Gronsburgh [Grundisburgh rectory], in the diocess of Norwich, valued £17. 11s. 3d. 3. Orwell rectory, in Ely diocess, valued £19. 7s. 7d. 1ob.

At this day Michael House is included in Trinity College; so called, not only because dedicated to God, One in Three Persons, but also because made by king Henry VIII. one of three Colleges; whereof (God willing) largely hereafter.

40, 41. *University Hall built by Richard Badew. A.D. 1326. Rebuilt (after it was burnt) by Elizabeth Countess of Clare, and named Clare Hall.*

Richard Badew, Chancellor, A.D. 1326.

He bought two tenements in Miln-street, of Neile Thornton, a physician; and on that ground built a small College, by the name of University Hall, placing a Principal therein, under whom scholars lived on their own expenses.\* This Richard Badew [or Baddow] was of a knightly family, born at Great Baddow, nigh Chelmsford in Essex, and employed all his estate to the advancement of learning.

Sixteen years did students continue in University Hall on their own charges; but a casual fire reduced their House to ashes. Here, by [the] way, whosoever shall consider in both Universities the ill contrivance of many chimneys, hollowness of hearths, shallowness of tunnels, carelessness of coals and candles, catchingness of papers, narrowness of studies, late reading and long watching of scholars, cannot but conclude, that an especial Providence preserveth those places. How small a matter hath sometimes made a partition betwixt the fire and the fuel! Thus an hair's breadth, fixed by a Divine finger, shall prove as effectual a separation from danger as a mile's distance. And although both Universities have had sad accidents in this kind, yet neither in number nor nature (since the Reformation) so destructive as in other places: so that, blessed be God! they have been rather scare-fires than hurt-fires unto them.

But, to return to Mr. Badew, who, sadly beholding the ruins of his Hall, perceived that the re-building thereof was a work too weighty for himself, (though a man of worship,) so that some person of honour must undertake it. And here happily a worthy lady presents herself, Elizabeth, third sister and co-heir of Gilbert earl of Clare, wife of John de Burge, lord of Connaught, and

\* SCOT'S "Tables" say "at the charges of the University."



mother to William de Burge, last earl of Ulster, who built it again of her own proper cost, endowed and called it Clare Hall.\*

MASTERS.—1. Walter Thaxted. 2. Ralph Kerdington. 3. John Dunwich. 4. John Chatteress. 5. Will. Radwinter. 6. Will. Wimble.† 7. Will. Wilfleet. 8. Will. Millington. 9. Thomas Stoyl. 10. Richard Stubs. 11. Gabriel Silvester. 12. Will. Woodhous. 13. Edm. Naturess. 14. John Crayford. 15. Rowl. Swinborn. 16. John Madew. 17. Thomas Barly. 18. Edmund Leeds. 19. Thomas Binge. 20. William Smith. 21. Robert Scot. 22. Thomas Pask. 23. Dr. Ralph Cudworth. 24. Theophilus Dillingham.

BENEFACTORS.—John Thaxto, Edith Green, William Ducket, Will. Worleigh, Will. Marshall, Ralph Srivemar, Thomas Cave; Dr. Stoyl, Dr. Naturess, Dr. Leeds, Dr. Scot, Masters of this Hall. Thomas Cecil, earl of Exeter, and his lady Dorothy, who gave £108 *per annum*, in very good rent. William Butler.‡ John Freeman, Esq. who gave £2000. George Ruggle, Fellow of the College: he gave in money and plate above £400. Sir Robert Heath, Mr. Thomas Binge, Humphrey Hide, Rob. Johnson, Esq. Mr. Erasmus Farrar, Mr. Will. Briden, Mr. Thomas Croply.

BISHOPS.—Nicholas Heath, archbishop of York. Augustine Lynsel, bishop of Hereford.

LEARNED WRITERS.—John Bois, dean of Canterbury, writer of the learned Postils. Richard Thompson. Augustine Lynsel. He set forth (when bishop of Peterborough) Theophylact in Greek (never before in print) on all St. Paul's epistles.

LIVINGS IN THE GIFT OF THE COLLEGE.—1. Litlington vicarage, in Ely diocess, valued £5. 19s. 9d. 2. Everton vicarage, in Lincoln diocess, valued £5. 13s. 8d. 3. Grandsden vicarage, Lincoln diocess, valued £3. 7s. 2d.

So that lately, (namely, *anno* 1634,) therein were maintained one Master, eighteen Fellows, thirty-six Scholars, beside Officers and Servants of the foundation, and other Students; the whole number being an hundred and six.

It were presumption in me to disturb this method of Masters, agreed on by Dr. Caius, Mr. Parker, and others. Otherwise, I would prepose Millington (first Provost afterwards of King's in the reign

\* In the deed of endowment, this liberal lady states her motives to be "a desire for the extension of every branch of useful learning, that there might no longer remain an excuse for ignorance; and to create a firmer concord and closer union among mankind, by the civilizing effects of indulgence in liberal study."—EDIT.

† Betwixt these two, Caius placeth William Gull, not owned by others.

‡ See more of him at his death, *anno* 1617 [in this vol. sect. ix. par. 4.]



of king Henry VI.) before Wilfleet, Master under king Richard III. I would also set Swinborn, both before and after Madew.

*Swinbornum Madew sequitur, Madewque vicissim  
Swinbornum ; sortes versat utrinque Deus.*

For it appeareth in Mr. Fox, that, after Madew's expulsion for being married, Swinborn succeeded him.\*

42—44. *Richard III. a (seeming) Benefactor to Clare Hall.*  
*This Hall long chapel-less: Solere the same with Clare Hall.*

I have read how Richard III. pretended himself descended from the foundress of this Hall, (which I account of more truth than his claim and title to the English crown,) and on that consideration, *tyrannidi suæ fucatum literarum patrocinium mendaci fronte obtendens*, saith my author,† he challenged the patronage of this Hall (when William Wilfleet was Master) to himself. But if no better patron to this House than protector to his own nephews, his courtesy might well have been spared. And because I find him omitted in Scot's last "Tables" (drawn up, no doubt, by the consent of this College) amongst the benefactors, I suspect this his fact as a flourish, (at which art he was excellent,) rather than any real favour to this foundation.

Long was it ere this Hall got a chapel to itself, (namely, till the year 1535,) all which time possibly they did their public devotions in that aisle of St. Edward's church, wherein anciently their Masters and Fellows were interred.

This Clare Hall was also called Solcre Hall in the days of Chaucer, as our antiquary hath observed:—‡

"And namely there was a great College;  
Men clepen it the Solere Hall of Cambridge." §

Some will say, "And whence termed Solere Hall? Was it not from *Solarium*, which in the Latin of that age signified 'a fair and light chamber?' Or is it not mistaken in pronouncing and printing for Scoller Hall, as otherwhiles it is written?" But the matter is not much; and whoso seeks a reason of all proper names of places, may seek it.

#### 45. *The Hall lately re-edified.*

This aged Hall, grown very ruinous, was lately taken down and re-edified by the bounty of several benefactors.|| Mr. Barnabas Oley,

\* In cardinal Pole's visitation of Cambridge in the reign of queen Mary. † See-  
*letos Cantabrigiensis*, made by R. PARKER. ‡ CAIUS, *Historia Cantab. Acad.*

page 57. § CHAUCER in the Reve's tale. || Dyer says, "The College, restored by the foundress, was again destroyed by fire, at least, in part—the Master's lodge, the treasury, and, among other papers, the archives. However, the College was new-built, and the first stone laid, May 19th, 1638."—EDIT.

late Fellow of this House, and Proctor of the University, may truly be termed "master of the fabric," so industrious and judicious was he in overseeing the same. Nor was he like the foolish builder that could not—but the unhappy that might not—finish his work, being outed the College, on the account of the Covenant. Had this structure been perfected according to the first design, no fault could have been found therewith, except that the brightness and beauty thereof should make the blear eyes of our envious age to smart, much grudging at the decency, more at the magnificence, of the Muses. Yet I cannot believe, what I read, that three or four hundred pounds' worth of timber, brought hither for the repair of this Hall, was lately taken away.\* Yea, had I seen it, I would not have believed mine own eyes, but rather suspected my sight, that some requisite to right sensation was wanting in me, and the fault either in the organ, medium, object, or undue distance thereof.†

Thomas de Foxton, Chancellor, Doctor of the Laws, A.D. 1329.

John de Langley, Chancellor, Doctor of Divinity; John de Shipeden, and Thomas de Bucknam, Proctors. 1331.

46. *King Edward foundeth King's Hall.* 7 Edward III.  
A.D. 1332.

King Edward III. understanding it was his father's intention to erect a College in Cambridge, in order whereunto he had for some years maintained thirty-two Scholars in the University, (occasioning the mistake of John Rouse, reporting he built a College therein,) laid the foundation of King's Hall,‡ out of some remorse that he had consented to the death of so affectionate a father; as one so transported with the news of the birth of his son, that he gave to one John Langer, a knight, three hundred pounds *pro primo rumore, quem idem Johannes tulit Edrardo secundo, de nativitate filii sui*, with a pension paid unto him many years after.§

MASTERS.—1. Mr. Thomas Powis. 2. Mr. Thomas Hetorset. [Hetherset.] 3. Mr. Radulph Selbie. 4. Mr. Richard Dearham. 5. Mr. John Stone. 6. Mr. Richard Holmes. 7. Mr. Robert Fitzhugh. 8. Mr. Richard Cawdery. 9. Mr. Robert Ayscough.

\* *Querela Cantabrigiensis*, page 14.

† See animadversions on these two sentences in "The Appeal of Injured Innocence," book xi. part 2.

‡ In Cambridge, *Colleges* and *Halls* are considered synonymous expressions; a Hall not being dissimilar to a College, either in its constitution or its endowment, and, consequently, neither of them qualified to claim any superiority over the other. Thus Clare Hall is called *Collegium, sive Domus, sive Aula de Clare*.—In Oxford, the five Halls are all inferior to the Colleges; because, though subject, as learned societies, to the same internal regulations as the Colleges, yet, not being incorporated, the property belonging to each of them is held in trust by the University.—EDIT.

§ *Pat.*

*Edwardi III. Rot. ii. membrana 7.*

10. Mr. Richard Listrope. [Scroope.] 11. Mr. Henry Booste.  
12. Mr. Richard le Scroope. 13. Mr. Galfride Blyth.

**BENEFACTORS.**—King Richard II. gave £53 yearly, out of the manor of Chesterton, &c. in lieu of much they formerly received out of the Exchequer with much trouble, and, over and above, £70 yearly out of the pensions of several abbeys. King Henry IV. gave them leave to pluck down the stately Hall in Cambridge Castle, therewith to build their chapel. King Henry VI. gave them one hundred and twenty volumes, and freed them from all accounting in the Exchequer. King Edward IV. gave them eight marks, to be paid by the sheriff of Cambridgeshire yearly, thereby to buy two robes.

**BISHOPS.**—Robert Fitzhugh, bishop of London, 1431.

**LEARNED WRITERS.**—

**COLLEGE LIVINGS.**—Felmersham vicarage, Lincoln diocess, valued at £13. 13s. 4d. Henclesham, Norwich diocess, ——. Grindon vicarage, [Glendon rectory,] Peterborough diocess, valued at £8. St. Mary's, Cantab. Ely diocess, ——. Chesterton vicarage, Ely diocess, valued at £10. 12s. 3d.

I had put pope Eugenius IV. in the catalogue of benefactors to this Hall, till I had discovered his bounty resolved into a point of revenge. For, at the instance of king Henry VI. he possessed on this Hall of the Rectory of Chesterton, nigh Cambridge, formerly engrossed (as many other English benefices in that age) by an alien, William bishop of Milan, from whom the pope extorted it,\* because he sided against him with Amadeus duke of Savoy (*alias* pope Felix V.) in the Council of Basil.

47—49. *Three Eminences of this Hall. Tempora mutantur. The Happiness of this Hall.*

This Hall then surpassed any College in the University, in a threefold respect. 1. For building; being of such receipt that it could entertain the king's court, without disturbance to the students. 2. For lands; though not effectually endowed by king Edward, till about the end of his reign, for the maintenance of one Custos and thirty-three Scholars under him. 3. For learning; many grave Seniors residing therein; so that this house was accounted *oraculum Academicæ*.†

The greater therefore our grief, that for want of intelligence (all the Records of this Hall being lost) our column for learned writers standeth so empty herein. This Hall at this day is united with others in Trinity College, on the north gate whereof standeth the stately statue of king Edward III. in armour.

\* R. PARKER in *Sceletos Cantab.* MS.

† *Idem, ibid.*

We must not forget how the Master and Fellows of this House were complained of, that they did Epicure it in daily exceedings ; as, indeed, where should men fare well, if not in a King's Hall ? Hereupon they of their own accord petitioned king Henry IV. that they might be stinted, not to exceed weekly eighteen—or at the highest twenty—pence in their commons ; the last two-pence being allowed them only in case of dearness of victuals and festival solemnities.\*

This House had one peculiar happiness, being of royal descent of both sides : I mean, founded by king Edward III. the founder of the two Houses of York and Lancaster, both deriving themselves from his body. Hence it was, that, during the civil wars, it found favour from the kings of both lines : whereas afterwards such Colleges which were, as I may say, but of the half-blood, built either by some prince of Lancaster or York, felt in process of time the anger of the one, because of the love of the other. Queen's College may be partly, and King's College too plainly, a pregnant instance thereof.

#### 50. *Privileges granted by King Edward III. to the University.*

Nor was king Edward bountiful to this Hall alone, but a great benefactor to the whole University, on which he conferred privileges, whereof these the principal :—

1. The mayor of the town should make assay of the bread, (whether the weight according to statute,) as oft as the Vice-Chancellor should require him.

2. That the Chancellor should receive the oaths of the mayor, bailiffs, and aldermen.

3. That licence should be given to the University to appropriate any church thereunto of forty pounds' yearly revenue.

4. That the Chancellor should not be disquieted for the imprisoning of such offenders whom he conceived deserving the same.

5. That such who [were] imprisoned by the Vice-Chancellor, should not be set free by the king's writ.

6. That Masters of Arts should not be cited out of the University into the Court of Christianity.

7. That the Chancellor should take cognizance of all causes wherein Scholars were concerned, these of maim and felonies only excepted.

Many immunities of lesser consequence did this king bestow on Cambridge, here too tedious to be repeated, largely exemplified and carefully preserved in the University-muniments.

\* CAIUS, *Historia Cant. Acad.* lib. 1. page 66.

Robert de Mildenhall, Doctor of Divinity, Chancellor, A.D. 1334.

Henry de Herwarden, Doctor of Law, Chancellor, 1335.

Richard de Harling, Doctor of Law, Chancellor, 1337.

Robert de Lung, Chancellor, 1339.

51, 52. *A German Marquess made Earl of Cambridge, A.D. 1340 ; and a Belgian Earl, A.D. 1342.*

William, marquess of Juliers, is created by king Edward III. the fourth earl of Cambridge, accounting this less honour no degradation, but advancement unto him ; nor the motion retrograde from a German marquess, to an English earl, whilst graced with the title of so famous an University. And this still justifies our former observation, that (the first earl alone excepted) none were dignified with the title of Cambridge, but either foreign free princes, or some nearly allied to the royal blood of England.

This year John earl of Hainault, brother to queen Philippa, wife to king Edward III. was created the fifth earl of Cambridge. And here may the reader take notice, that I meet with a difference in authors ; some making this John first earl of Cambridge : on whose forfeiture thereof, (for his siding with the French king,) king Edward conferred the same on William the foresaid marquess of Juliers. Others make the said marquess earl of Cambridge, before John earl of Hainault was graced with the title. All agree that both were earls thereof ; and the transposition of them is no whit material to our History of the University.

53, 54. *Mary de Saint Paul founds Pembroke Hall, and Denny Abbey. A.D. 1343.*

Mary de Saint Paul, daughter to Guido Castillion earl of Saint Paul in France, third wife to Audomare de Valentia earl of Pembroke,—maid, wife, and widow all in a day, (her husband being unhappily slain at a tilting at her nuptials,) sequestered herself on that sad accident from all worldly delights, bequeathed her soul to God, and her estate to pious uses, amongst which this a principal,—that she founded in Cambridge the College of Mary de Valentia,\* commonly called Pembroke Hall. She survived the death of her husband forty-two years, and died full of days and good

\* In the celebrated speech of Sir Symonds D'Ewes, in the House of Commons, he makes the following mention of this College :—"The most ancient and first-endowed College in England was Valence College in Cambridge, which, after the foundation thereof, as appears by one of our Parliamentary Rolls remaining upon record in the Tower of London, received the new name or appellation of Pembroke Hall. It is in *Rot. Parliam. de anno 38 Henrici VI. num. 31.*" —EDIT.

deeds: a Hall afterwards much augmented by the benefaction of others.

**MASTERS.**—1. Thomas de Bingham. 2. Robert de Thorp. 3. Richard de Morris. 4. John Tinmew. 5. John Sudbury. 6. John Langton. 7. Hugh Dainlet. 8. Laurence Booth. 9. Thomas Rotherham. 10. George Fitzhugh. 11. Roger Leyburne. 12. Richard Fox. 13. Robert Shorton. 14. Robert Swinburne. 15. George Folburie. 16. Nicholas Ridley. 17. John Young. 18. Edmund Grindal. 19. Matthew Hutton. 20. John Whitgift. 21. John Young. 22. William Fulke. 23. Lancelot Andrews. 24. Samuel Harsenet. 25. Nicholas Felton. 26. Jerom Beale. 27. Benjamin Laney. 28. Richard Vines. 29. Sidrach Simpson.

**BENEFACTORS.**—1. Henry VI. 2. Edward Story. 3, 4. Gerhard and Nicholas Shipwith. 5. Dr. Atkinson. 6. William Hussy, knight. 7. Charles Booth. 8. Roger Strange, knight. 9. Dr. Watts. 10. William Marshall. 11, 12. William and Alice Smart. 13. Jane Cox, widow. 14. John Langton. 15. Laurence Booth. 16. Thomas Scot, *alias* Rotherham. 17. Richard Fox. 18. Dr. Shorton. 19. Edmund Grindal. 20. John Whitgift. 21. William Fulke. 22. Lancelot Andrews.

**BISHOPS.**—1. William Bottlesham, bishop of Rochester. 2. William Linwoode, bishop of St. David's. 3. John Langton, bishop of St. David's. 4. Laurence Booth, archbishop of York.\* 5. Thomas Rotherham, archbishop of York. 6. Edward Story, bishop of Chichester. 7. Thomas Langton, bishop of Winchester. 8. Richard Foxe, bishop of Winchester. 9. William Smith, bishop of Lincoln. 10. Roger Leyburne, bishop of Carlisle. 11. Nicholas Ridley, bishop of London. 12. John Christopherson, bishop of Chichester. 13. Edmund Grindal, archbishop of Canterbury. 14. John Young, bishop of Rochester. 15. Matthew Hutton, archbishop of York. 16. John Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury. 17. Thomas Dove, bishop of Peterborough. 18. John Bridges, bishop of Oxford. 19. Lancelot Andrews, bishop of Winchester. 20. Samuel Harsenet, archbishop of York. 21. Theophilus Field, bishop of St. David's. 22. Nicholas Felton, bishop of Ely. 23. Matthew Wren, bishop of Ely. 24, 25. Roger Dod, Randolph Barlow, bishops in Ireland.

**LEARNED WRITERS.**—1. William Linwoode, famous for his writing the Provincial Constitutions of Canterbury. 2. John Somerset, Doctor of Physic to king Henry VI. 3. John Thixstill, whose *Αὐτὸς ἔφη* carried it in the Schools.† 4, 5, 6. John Rogers,

\* Charles Booth, bishop of Hereford, ought to be inserted in this catalogue, bred in, benefactor to, this Hall.

† See more of him hereafter, namely, *anno* 1525.

the first—Nicholas Ridley, the most learned—John Bradford, the hardest—martyr under queen Mary. 7. William Fulke, who so learnedly confuted the Rhemish Testament: not to repeat these many worthy bishops, besides many other writers since, unknown unto me. 8. Edmund Spenser, prime of English poets.

COLLEGE LIVINGS.—Tilney vicarage, in Norwich diocess, valued at £30. Soham vicarage, in Norwich diocess, valued £32. 16s. Overton Waterville rectory, in Lincoln diocess, valued ——. Saxthorp vicarage, in Norwich diocess, valued £4. 13s. 4d. Rawreth rectory, in London diocess, valued £20. 13s. 4d. Waresley vicarage, in Lincoln diocess, ——.

Wherein there is, at this present, a Master, nineteen Fellows, one *Tanquam*, thirty-three Scholars of the House, beside Officers and Servants of the foundation, with other Students; the whole number being one hundred.

The aforesaid Mary de Valentiâ founded also Denney Abbey, nigh Cambridge, richly endowed, and filled it with nuns, whom she removed from Waterbeach. She enjoined also her Fellows of Pembroke Hall, to visit those nuns, and give them ghostly counsel on just occasion; who may be presumed, (having not only a fair invitation, but full injunction,) that they were not wanting both in their courteous and conscientious addresses unto them.

54—56. *Two remarkable Pieces of Plate. An invidious Elogy of this Hall. Robert de Thorp Lord Chancellor.*

Amongst the ancient plate of this Hall, two pieces are most remarkable: one silver and gilt, of the foundress's, (produced on festivals,) who, being of French extraction, was much devoted to their tutelar saint; witness this inscription, as I remember it:—

“Saint Dionyse is my dear;  
Wherefore be merry, and make good cheer.”

The other, very like the former, weighing sixty-seven ounces, the gift of Thomas Langton, bishop of Winton. with this inscription:—*Thomas Langton, Winton. Episcopus, Aulae Pembrochianae olim Socius, dedit hanc tassiam coopertam eidem Aulae 1497. Qui alienaret, anathema sit.*

King Henry VI. was so great a favourer of this House, that it was termed his adopted daughter, (King's College only being accounted his natural son,) and great were his benefactions bestowed thereon. But, above all, we take notice of that passage in his charter, granting (repeated in another of king Edward's confirming) lands to this House:—*Notabile et insigne, et quàm pretiosum Collegium, quod inter omnia loca Universitatis (prout certitudinaliter informamur) mirabiliter splendet et semper resplenduit.* Now,



although it is frequent for inferiors to flatter their superiors, it is seldom seen that subjects are praised by their sovereigns without due cause ; as this doth appear true to such who seriously peruse our foregoing catalogue. And though the commendation in the king's charter be confined to Cambridge ; yet may it be extended to any College in Christendom of the same proportion for students therein. I say, (as the apostle in another kind,) that there may be an equality, 2 Cor. viii. 14, let Pembroke Hall be compared with any foundation in Europe not exceeding it in bigness, time, and number of members, and it will acquit itself not conquered in all learned and liberal capacities.

Amongst the Masters of this Hall, Robert de Thorp, the second in number, was, in the thirtieth year of king Edward III. Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas ; \* which place he held thirteen years, till 1371, when he was made Lord Chancellor of England. His executors, *anno* 1375, gave forty marks a-piece to every College in Cambridge, (then eight in number,) out of his own estate ; who in his life-time began the public schools, as we shall show hereafter.

57, 58. *A Greek and grateful Scholar. Benefactors in losing their Lives.*

Amidst the benefactors, Thomas Watts, Doctor of Divinity, and Archdeacon of Middlesex, gave certain farms in Ashwell and Sawston for the maintenance of seven scholars, by the name of Greek Scholars. Lancelot Andrews was one of his foundation ; who at this day is neither indebted to this House in general, to which he gave (besides plate, three hundred folio books, &c.) one thousand pounds for two Fellowships : nor to the memory of Dr. Watts in particular, whose poor kindred he afterwards sought after, found out, and relieved (shall I say ?) or rewarded.

Nor must Reynere de Aubeney, and Robert de Stanton, (both first Fellows of this College,) be forgotten amongst the benefactors, being employed as procurators at Rome, to Pope Innocent VI. to obtain the appropriation of some rectories, the patronage whereof the foundress had conferred on the College. In which service (well forwarded, but not finished by them) they there ended their lives ; and in gratitude to their memories, a statute was made in the College, that their obsequies should yearly be kept in the month of July.

And now we take our farewell of this Hall, when we have remembered how queen Elizabeth, passing by the same in her progress to Cambridge, 1566, saluted it with this expression, *O domus antiqua et religiosa !* “ O ancient and religious house ! ”

\* SPELMAN, *Glossarium*, page 417.



## SECTION III.

DOMINO GULIELMO PASTON, DE PASTON IN COM.  
NORF. EQUITI AURATO, PATRONO MEO COLEN-  
DISSIMO.

NUMERANTUR anni plus minus triginta ex quo tu Cantabrigiæ, invidendum decus Collegii Corporis Christi, literis operam navasti.

Effluxit jam decennium a quo Europam, Asiam, Africam peragrasti. Nullo pignore cum tuis oculis meus calamus certabit, cùm tibi perlustranti, quàm mihi describenti, plures regionès objectæ fuerint.

Te olim Alumnum, nunc Judicem, statuit Cantabrigia, an orbis Christianus, Oxonio sorore exceptâ, aliquid ei aut æquum aut æmulum exhibeat.

Omnia eveniant ex votis tibi sobolique tuæ, de quâ hoc addam unicum: Si domus tua antiqua tot visura sit dominos cognomines, posteros, quot videt majores, mundus jam senescens planè bis puer prorsùs delirabit.

1. *The two Cambridge Guilds united.* A.D. 1344.

Here at this time were two eminent guilds or fraternities of town-folk in Cambridge, consisting of brothers and sisters, under a chief annually chosen, called an "alderman." 1. The guild of *Corpus Christi*, keeping their prayers in St. Benedict church. 2. The guild of the blessed Virgin, observing their offices in St. Mary's church. Betwixt these there was a zealous emulation, which of them should amortize and settle best maintenance for such chaplains to pray for the souls of those of their brotherhood. Now though generally in those days the stars outshined the sun; I mean, more honour (and, consequently, more wealth) was given to Saints than to Christ himself; yet here the guild of *Corpus Christi* so outstripped that of the Virgin Mary in endowments, that the latter (leaving off any farther thoughts of contesting) desired an union; which being embraced, they both were incorporated together.

2—4. Corpus Christi, or *Bene't College* built. *Henry Duke of Lancaster the honorary Founder. Stow's Mistake, with the Ground thereof.*

Thus being happily married, they were not long issueless, but a small College was erected by their united interest, which, bearing the name of both parents, was called "the College of *Corpus Christi* and the blessed Mary." However, it hath another working-day name, commonly called (from the adjoined church) *Bene't College*; yet so, that on festival solemnities (when written in Latin, in public instruments) it is termed by the foundation-name thereof.

Some years after, the guild made their addresses to Henry duke of Lancaster, (a kind of guardian to the king, in his minority,) and politicly chose him alderman of their society. They knew, a friend in the court is as good as money in the purse; and, because the procurer is a giver at the second-hand, they conceived his countenance very advantageous to obtain their mortmain; as, indeed, this lord did them duke's service thereip, and the manor of Barton was partly the fruit of his bounty, encouraging also many by his example to the same work: but chiefly, 1. Sir John Cambridge, knight, and Thomas his son, esquire, who gave to the college thirty-five or thirty-six tenements, besides his capital messuage called the Stonehouse, and a hundred acres of ground, wanting one rood, in Cambridge and Nuneham. 2. Henry Tangmere, townsman of Cambridge, (and in his turn alderman of the guild,) gave, by his will, eighteen or nineteen houses in Cambridge and Nuneham, and in lands at both ends of the town eighty-five acres. 3. Thomas de Eltisley, chosen first Master of the College, (not that the place might maintain him, but he the place,) being richly beneficed, and well seen in secular affairs, gave much to this House; and intended more, had not Robert de Eltisley, clerk, his younger brother, executor and feoffee for the College, defeated the same. Thus was the foundation soon enlarged into a Master and eight Fellows, three Bible-Clerks, and six Scholars; their chief maintenance arising from candle-rents in Cambridge, being so well-stored with houses therein, that every Scholar had two, every Fellow five, and the Master more than ten, for his proportion; though at this day they can hardly produce half the number, the rest being either sold, exchanged, or lost by continuance of time and carelessness of their officers.

Be it here remembered that John Stow, in the abridgment of his "Annals," set out, 1566, by one mistake doth a double injury to this College, by referring it to a false founder, and assigning a wrong (much later) age thereof, when affirming that John of Gaunt built the same about the year 1357. But his error is grounded

herein,—because John-a-Gaunt married Blanch, the daughter and heir of the aforesaid duke of Lancaster, and was an especial friend and favourer to this foundation. For when a flaw was found in their mortmain, for want of some legal punctuality; and when it was certified by inquisition into the Chancery, by John Repingale, the king's escheator, that the lands of this guild were forfeited to the crown; John of Gaunt procured their confirmation to the College.

*5—7. The superstitious Procession on Corpus-Christi Day endeth in a Feast at Bene't College. The Canopy ominously fired.*

A grand solemnity was observed by this guild every *Corpus-Christi* day, (being always the Thursday after Trinity Sunday,) according to this equipage:—1. The alderman of the guild for that year (as Master of the Ceremonies) went first in procession. 2. Then the elders thereof (who had been aldermen, or were near the office) carrying silver shields enamelled in their hands,\* bestowed on the brotherhood, some by Henry duke of Lancaster, some by Henry Tangmere afore-mentioned. 3. There the Master of this College, in a silk cope under a canopy, carrying the Host in the pix, or rich box of silver gilt, having two for the purpose: (1.) One called “the gripe's eye,” given by Henry Tangmere. (2.) Another, weighing seventy-eight ounces, bestowed by Sir John Cambridge. 4. Then the Vice-Chancellor, with the University-men in their seniorities. 5. Lastly, the mayor of the town and burgesses thereof. Thus from Bene't church they advanced to the great bridge, through all the parts of the town, and so returned with a good appetite to the place where they began.

Then in *Corpus-Christi* College was a dinner provided them, where, good stomachs meeting with good cheer and welcome, no wonder if mirth followed of course. Then out comes the cup of John Goldcorne, (once alderman of the guild,) made of an horn, with the cover and appurtenances of silver and gilt, which he gave this Company, and all must drink therein. And although some years after happened the dissolution of this guild, (the exact date whereof I cannot learn,) yet the Master of this College continued this custom of procession till it was abolished in the reign of king Henry VIII.

It is remarkable, that, in the procession, that canopy under which the Host was carried fell on fire, leaving men to guess, as they stood affected, whether it was done casually by the carelessness of the torch-bearers,—or maliciously, by some covertly casting fire thereon out of some window,—or miraculously, to show, that God

\* *Scuta argentea obrizo circumducta.*

would shortly consume such superstition. And, indeed, in the twenty-seventh of king Henry VIII. when Thomas Legh, Doctor of Law, visited the University, the same was finally abrogated. Then those silver trinkets were sold, and those shields had their property altered, to fence and defend the College from wind and weather, being converted into money, and laid out in reparations.

8, 9. *The Townsmen quarrel for their Dinner: are cast by the King's Commissioners.*

However, the townsmen still importunately claimed their dinner as due unto them, insomuch that Richard Roulfe,\* then mayor of the town, required it of the College in a commanding manner. The Master and Fellows whereof resolved to teach the townsmen a distinction, to put difference betwixt a debt and a courtesy, this dinner falling under the latter notion. They minded them also of the maxim in logic, how *sublatâ causâ, tollitur effectus*, "the procession (*the cause*) being taken away, the dinner (as *the effect*) ceased therewith." But, the belly having no ears, nothing would satisfy the other party, save a suit, themselves prejudging the cause on their own side. Insomuch that what they brewed in their hopes, they broached in their brags, boasting that as the houses belonging to this College came originally from townsmen, so now they should return to the townsmen again, as forfeited for default of this dinner. Yea, so confident they were of success, that they, very equally-unequally, (because invading other men's right,) divided aforehand such houses amongst themselves. But the worst and coldest *fur* † is what is to be made of a bear's skin, which is to be killed.

For the College procured that certain Commissioners were sent down by the king, (amongst whom [were] John Hind, knight, sergent-at-law, and John Hutton, esq.) to examine the matter, and summon the Master and Fellows to appear before them: who, appearing accordingly, produced most authentical evidences and charters of mortmain, whereby their lands in Cambridge were sufficiently conveyed and confirmed unto them. And thus the townsmen, both hungry and angry at the loss both of their dinner and houses, were fain to desist.

\* No such appeareth in the Cambridge catalogue of mayors, mistaken probably for Richard Woolfe, mayor, *anno* 1529, and now active in the absence or sickness of the mayor.

† Evidently a play upon its Latin meaning, "a robber," while apparently giving its common English signification of "the skin and soft hair of beasts with which garments are lined for warmth."—EDIT.

### 10. *Duchess of Norfolk builds their Buttresses.*

To return to the benefactors of this College : The buttresses thereof were, in the reign of king Henry VII. made at the cost of Elizabeth duchess of Norfolk ; and God grant (say I) good buttresses to the Colleges in both Universities, to support them firmly against all opposition ! The said duchess founded also one Fellowship, and one Bible-Clerkship.

### 11. *The Benefaction of Matthew Parker.*

But amongst modern benefactors, none to be mentioned with Matthew Parker, Master of the College, if we consider what thereunto,

1. *He saved*—in stating their accounts, and regulating the method of their rents, carelessly kept (that is, lost in effect) before his time.

2. *He gave*—beside many invaluable manuscripts, two Fellowships, and five Scholarships.

3. *He recovered*—a basin and ewer of silver from the executors of Laurence Maptyde ; a rent-charge, of fifty shillings yearly, (detained for a long time,) out of the manor of Gerton. He disburdened the College of a pension, for the impropriation of Grantchester, and cast it (where it was due) on the farmer.

Now, I conceive this is the best. benefaction,—to recover the diverted donations of former benefactors ; partly, because it keepeth *the dead from being wronged*, restoring their gifts according to their true intentions ; partly, because it keepeth *the living from doing wrong*, and continuing their unjust detentions.

### 12. *A great Favourer of Norfolk-men.*

I confess some have complained of this Matthew Parker, that, in favour to his native county, he made all this College to Norfolkize, appropriating most Fellowships thereunto. But the worst I wish this College is, that they may have the like Benefactor, who on the same terms may be partial to the same county.

MASTERS.—1. Thomas Eltisley. 2. Richard Treaton. 3. John Kynne. 4. John Neckton. 5. Richard Billingsford. 6. John Titshall. 7. John Botryght. 8. Walter Smith. 9. Simon Green. 10. Thomas Cosin. 11. John Ediman. 12. Peter Nobis. 13. William Sowde. 14. Matthew Parker. 15. Laurence Maptyde. 16. John Porey. 17. Thomas Aldriche. 18. Robert Norgate. 19. John Copcot. 20. John Jegon. 21. Thomas Jegon. 22. Samuel Walsal. 23. Henry Butts. 24. Richard Love.

BENEFACTORS.\*—1. Margaret Brotherton, duchess of Norfolk.

\* Namely, beside the aforementioned.

2. John Meers, esquire-beadle. 3. Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper, bred in this College. 4. Roger Manners, esquire. 5. Roger Manners, earl of Rutland. 6. Mr. William Benedict. 7. Mr. Leonard Cawson.

BISHOPS.—1. Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury. 2. Richard Fletcher, bishop of London. 3. John Jegon, bishop of Norwich. 4. Anthony Watson, Fellow, bishop of Chichester.\*

LEARNED WRITERS.—Henry Hornby.

COLLEGE-LIVINGS.—Landbeach rectory, in Ely diocess, valued at £10. 1s. 3d. Wilbraham Parva rectory, in Ely diocess, valued at £19. 16s. 8d. St. Bene't Cantab. in Ely diocess, valued at £4. 9s. 9d. Grantchester vicarage, in Ely diocess, valued at £7. 14s. 3d. St. Mary Abchurch rectory, in London, £2. 2s. 6d.

So that lately, *anno* 1634, there were maintained in this College, one Master, twelve Fellows, thirty-seven Scholars; beside Officers, and Servants of the foundation, with other Students; the whole number being one hundred twenty and six.

13—15. *Dr. Sowde and Dr. Copcot. The College Arms why altered. Where I had my Instructions of this College.*

Of the foresaid Masters, the thirteenth in order, namely, William Sowde, is, with Mr. Fooke, (Fellow also of this College,) acknowledged by Mr. Fox a great favourer and fatherer of the truth in the dark days of king Henry VIII.† Dr. Copcot, the nineteenth Master, (born at Calais,) was a great critic in the Latin and Greek tongues, very familiar with Drusius, who wrote a letter to him, subscribed, *Manibus Johannis Copcot*, “to the ghost of John Copcot,”—so much was the Doctor macerated with his constant studying.

We must not forget, how, in the beginning of the Reformation, some took exceptions at the ancient arms of this College as superstitious; and therefore, at the desire of Matthew Parker, the heralds did alter them, and assigned new ones, namely, *azure*, a pelican, on her nest, over her young ones *argent*, pecking out her own blood, *guttee*, proper *gules*, three lilies *argent*:‡ and thus a poet commented on them:—

*Signat avis Christum, qui sanguine pascit alumnos.  
Lilia, virgo parens, intemerata refert.*

So that still they innocently relate to the ancient guilds of *Corpus Christi* and the virgin Mary, united in this foundation.

So much of this College: the ancient history, out of the archives whereof, my good friend, Mr. Crofts, (Fellow of the same, lately

\* Godwin in his catalogue of bishops set forth 1616.  
1013.

† “Acts and Monuments,”

‡ I aim more at plainness than terms of heraldry.

gone to God,) communicated unto me, with the courteous consent of Dr. Richard Love, the worthy Master of this College. Yea, I must thankfully confess myself once a Member at large of this House, when they were pleased, above twenty years since, freely (without my thoughts thereof) to choose me Minister of St. Benedict's church, the parish adjoining, and in their patronage.

16—18. *A Bank and a Lank of Charity. William Bateman foundeth Trinity Hall. The Master's Catalogue might be amended. A.D. 1347.*

Two years after was Trinity Hall begun. I confess, building of Colleges goeth not by planets, but by Providence; yet it is observable, that now we had four founded within the compass of seven years:—Pembroke Hall and Bene't College, already past; Trinity Hall and Gonville Hall, immediately following. Thus as the zeal of Achaia provoked many, 2 Cor. ix. 2; so here, when one once brake the ice, many followed the same beaten track of charity. Whereas, on the other side, when men's hands begin to be out of giving, it is a long time before they recover the right stroke again; after this feast followed a famine; for it was almost a hundred years betwixt the founding of Gonville Hall and the next, which was King's College; though charity, in the interval, may be presumed not to stand still, but to move, not in the generation of new—but augmentation of old—foundations.

Now, Trinity Hall was built by William Bateman, born in the city of Norwich, and became to be *episcopus in patriâ*, afterwards “bishop in the place of his nativity.” He was one of a very stout spirit, and very well skilled in civil and canon law, (and we may presume the common law, too, because a Norfolk-man,) therefore employed by the king to the pope; in which embassy he died in Avignon. The place whereon he built this his Hall belonged formerly to the monks of Ely; John de Crawden, their Prior, purchasing, and other benefactors enlarging the same; so that it was a House for Students before bishop Bateman (and by the exchange for the advowsons of certain rectories) procured it into his own possession.

He appointed by his foundation only one Master, two Fellows, and three Scholars,—all of them to be students of the canon and civil law; allowing one divine to be amongst them: whose number and maintenance have since been much increased by other benefactors.

MASTERS.—1. Adam de Wichmere. 2. Robert Braunch. 3. Simon Dallinge. 4. Simon Thornton. 5. William Dallinge. 6. Edward Shuldham. 7. John Wright. 8. Walter Huke. 9. Robert Larke. 10. Stephen Gardiner. 11. William Mouse.



12. Henry Harvey. 13. John Preston. 14. John Cowell. 15. Clemens Corbet. 16. Thomas Eden. 17. Dr. Bonde.

**BENEFACTORS.**—1. Mr. Simon Dallinge. 2. Walter Huke. 3. Robert Goodnap. 4. John Maptyde. 5. Gabriel Dun. 6. Richard Nix, bishop of Norwich. 7. Stephen Gardiner. 8. Matthew Parker. 9. Dr. Mouse. 10. Dr. Harvey. 11. Mr. Busbie. 12. Mr. Hare, esq. 13. Dr. Cowell. 14. Sir George Newman, knight.

**BISHOPS.**—1. Marmaduke Lumley, bishop of Lincoln. 2. Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester. 3. Richard Sampson, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield. 4. William Barlow, bishop of Lincoln.

**LEARNED WRITERS.**—1. Stephen Gardiner, Lord Chancellor of England. 2. Walter Haddon, Master of Requests to queen Elizabeth. 3. John Cowell, famous for his “Interpreter,” and other learned works.

**COLLEGE LIVINGS.**—Fenstanton vicarage in Lincoln diocese, valued at £11. 11s. 4d. 2q. Great Stukeley vicarage, in Lincoln diocese, valued at £6. 14s. 2d. Hemingford vicarage, in Lincoln diocese, valued at £9. 16s. 10d. Wethersfield vicarage, in London diocese, valued at £12. Swanington rectory, in Norwich diocese, valued at £6. 11s. 5d. 1ob. Gaysley [Gazeley] vicarage, in Norwich diocese, valued at £7. 3s. 4d. St. Edward’s Cantab. in Ely diocese. Woodalling vicarage, in Norwich diocese, valued at £8. 8s. 3d.

So there are at this present, (namely, *anno* 1634,) one Master, twelve Fellows, fourteen Scholars; besides Officers, and Servants of the foundation, with other Students; the whole number being three-score.

I am loath to discompose the catalogue of Masters, warranted both by Dr. Caius and Mr. Parker; otherwise, might I insert my own observations. After Robert Braunch, I would nominate Henry Wells, Master of Arts, and next to him Marmaduke Lumley. I would also, after Stephen Gardiner, place Walter Haddon, for one year in the reign of king Edward VI. and after him, Dr. Mouse, in the same king’s reign; then Gardiner again, in the first of queen Mary; and Mouse again, after Gardiner’s death: submitting all to the censure of those in that foundation, as best read in their own records.

### 19, 20. *A pious Design. A bitter Retort.*

Henry Harvey, the twelfth Master of this Hall, was he who, out of a pious intent, (as we are bound to believe, because profitable to others,) with great expense did make a causeway on the south and



other sides of Cambridge, for the more convenience of passengers in those dirty ways. So that his bounty has made summer unto them in the depth of winter, allowing a large annual revenue for the maintenance thereof.

Here I cannot forbear one passage, which I may call “a serious jest,” which happened on this occasion. A noble person (but great anti-academic) met Dr. Harvey one morning, overseeing his workmen; and, bitterly reflecting on his causelessly-suspected inclinations to popery, “Doctor,” said he, “you think that this causeway is the high way to heaven.” To whom the other as tartly replied, “Not so, sir; for then I should not have met you in this place.”

21, 22. *A Dispensation for Increase of Commons. The exceeding Cheapness of all Commodities.*

We must not forget, that, when Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, made his metropolitical visitation at Cambridge, about sixty years after the first founding of the House; on the instance and entreaty of the Master and Fellows thereof, he granted a dispensation unto them for enlarging their commons; a copy whereof, carefully transcribed out of the original, we have here inserted.\*

*Thomas, permissione Divinâ, &c. dilectis in Christo filiis, Custodi et Sociis Collegii Sanctæ Trinitatis, Universitatis Cantabrigiæ, salutem, gratiam, et benedictionem.—Supplicatio pro parte vestrâ in visitatione nostrâ metropolitica, in Eliensi diocesi, et Collegio vestro exercita, et adhuc durante, nobis proposita continebat; quòd portio singulorum virorum ad communas vestras in dicto Collegio limitata, etsi ad uberiores providentiam ejusdem Collegii pro numero Sociorum suppetant facultates, in tantum est restricta et diminuta, quòd considerata præsentis temporis caristia, inde non poteritis commodè sustentari. Nos verò, præmissis inspectis et consideratis, ut ad Dei laudem in studio eò melius proficere valeatis, quòd vos aliundè victum quærere non oportet, ut singulis septimanis sexdecim denarios de bonis communibus Collegii vestri antedicti singulorum Sociorum nomine in communibus exponere poteritis, consuetudinibus in contrarium, seu observantiâ, etiam juramento, aut confirmationibus superiorum non obstantibus quibuscunque, de nostrâ gratiâ speciali misericorditer dispensamus; nobis nihilominus de restringendo easdem communas, seu etiam augmentando, pro locis et temporibus opportunis, potestatem specialem reservantes. Dat. &c.*

Of which faculty (to spare a formal translation thereof) this the effect: The Fellows of the House were tied up, by orders of their

\* *Regist. Cur. Cant. in T. Arundel, transcribed by Mr. Blewet.*

founder, to so short a sum, to provide commons therewith, that it would not furnish them with Agur's wish, "food convenient for them," considering the present scarcity of commodities. Whereupon the archbishop, by this instrument, (wisely reserving like power to his successors,) dispensed with them; that, notwithstanding their statutes to the contrary, they might expend sixteen-pence a-week in commons, two-pence for the week-days, a groat for the Lord's-day.

True it is, that in the reign of king Edward I. all victuals were exceeding cheap, universally all over the land; when an Act of Common Council was made, confirmed by the king and his nobility, that, in London itself, (where provisions may be presumed dearest,) a fat cock was to be sold for three half-pence, two pullets at the same rate, a fat capon for two-pence half-penny, a goose four-pence, a mallard and partridge three half-pence a-piece, two woodcocks for the same price, &c. a fat lamb,\* (counted in the nature of poultry, second-course meat,) from Christmas to Shrovetide, six-pence, and, all the year after, four-pence; mutton, veal, pork, and beef being all cheap proportionably.

### 23, 24. *Causes of Dearness. Nor full, nor fasting.*

But since men multiplied, and more money daily was imported by the easterlings, prices of all victuals grew very high; and this very year, wherein this dispensation was granted, being 1405, the seventh of king Henry IV. by reason of much waste made by the civil wars, at that time all victuals were much enhanced. Wherefore, to use the prophet's phrase, "The ephah being now made small and the shekel great," the Scholars in this Hall had just cause to petition for an augmentation of money to buy their commons. But since the finding out of the West-Indies, in the reign of king Henry VII. and the daily importing of silver, prices of all commodities are mounted to an incredible proportion to what they were anciently.

Indeed, (pardon a digression,) this present year, A.D. 1655, is as plentiful as any memory alive can parallel; so that we want nothing but grateful hearts to God for the same. For it is strange, that, when the valleys laugh and sing with corn, the owners should sigh and cry for the same. Yea, such is men's peevishness, as if it endeavoured to puzzle Omnipotency to please it, betwixt the pining of the poor in penury, and the repining of the rich in plenty. And, as the infidel prince would not believe that God could send plenty in Samaria, though he "should open the windows of heaven," 2 Kings vii. 2, 19; so some covetous cormorant-cormongers despair

\* JOHN STOW'S "History," page 207.

that he should send a dearth of grain amongst us, should he stop the windows thereof, drought never making a dearth in England. But how quickly they may be confuted, and our present plenty justly turned into want, to God alone is known.

### 25. *Convenient Diet needful for Students.*

But, to return to the scholars of Trinity-Hall. True it is, that a body surfeited with food is unfit for study : scholars, like hawks, flying best when sharp, and not full gorged : and the monk's verse hath much truth in it :—

*Distentus venter non vult studere libenter.*

And yet perchance,

*Laudavit pleno monachus jejuna ventre.*

“He praised fasting when he was full himself.” However, there may be a fault as well in the defect, as on the excess ; and there is a distention as well of wind and emptiness, as of flesh and fulness, equally impeditive to a studious mind, and therefore good reason that the fare of these scholars should be enlarged.

### 26—28. *Gonville-Hall founded. Archbishop Ufford a Commoner therein. This Hall transplanted. A.D. 1348.*

Edmund Gonville, (younger brother to Sir Nicholas Gonville, of Rushworth, knight,) parson of Terrington and Rushworth, in Norfolk, where he had founded a College of canons, valued at the Dissolution, at —, built also a Hall, dedicated to the Virgin Mary, on the place where now are the orchard and tennis-court of Bene't College, five years after having its situation altered.

Whilst this Hall continued here, one eminent commoner lived therein, namely, John Ufford, Doctor of Law, son to the earl of Suffolk, and, by royal appointment, with the papal consent, made archbishop of Canterbury ; but, dying before his consecration, probable (if surviving) to prove a good benefactor to this Hall. But he departed this life somewhat before Edmund Gonville, (the Hall losing so good father and so hopeful a friend, in a short space,) though the latter left a large sum of money to William Bateman, bishop of Ely, to see this foundation finished according to his directions.

Bishop Bateman desired to bring this new Hall nearer his own of Trinity Hall ; partly, because he might oversee both his child and nurse-child at the same inspection ; partly, to invite converse betwixt these two countryfolk-foundations, (both of Norfolk parentage,) by their vicinity of situation. This was done accordingly. Infants are easily portable from place to place ; and this Hall, not

yet fully rooted, was quickly removed. An exchange is made with Bene't College, for their mutual conveniency, and Gonville Hall transplanted to the place where it standeth at this day; and where it fareth the worse for the town's over-fond embracing thereof, so surrounding it on all sides, that it wanteth those walks other Colleges do enjoy.

**29, 30. *Two noble Students. Fishwick's Hostel given to this Hall.***

This House was afterwards honoured with Students of the highest extraction, amongst whom, of chiefest remark, Humphrey and Edward, sons to John de la Pole, duke of Suffolk; whose elder brother having undone himself and his family, these betook themselves to their books, preferring to claim learning as their own right, rather than to be called "lords" by the courtesy of others. However, though both in Orders, they attained no considerable church-preferment, (Edward only getting the archdeaconry of Richmond,) not for want of worth, but, probably, because overlooked by the jealous eye of king Henry VII. So impossible it was any plant should grow great under such a malignant influence.

We must not forget how William Fishwick, esquire-beadle of the University, bestowed his dwelling-house on this Hall, turned afterwards into an Hostel, and beautified with fair buildings; not entire in itself, but retaining to Gonville Hall. This Fishwick's Hostel, though worse than a Cambridge- was better than any Oxford-Hall; as partly endowed by the bounty of William Revel, rector of Tichwell in Norfolk, who in his own benefice built several chambers and lodgings, whither the Fishwickians might retire, either for pleasure in summer, or safety in sickness. Above fourscore commoners have lived at once in this Hostel, repairing for prayers to Gonville chapel, and, if dying, interred therein. Since it is assumed into Trinity College.

**31—33. *Papal Indulgences. Masters, Benefactors, &c. of Gonville Hall. The Earl of Cambridge. A.D. 1351—1361.***

As for Gonville Hall, it flourished by the bounty of several benefactors; yea, it found some popes much befriending it: as Sixtus IV. who (notwithstanding the decree of Benedict XI. enjoining all Benedictine monks to study in University Hall) dispensed with those of Norwich to reside in Gonville Hall. Also Alexander VI. gave them leave yearly to send two to preach in any part of England without control.

**MASTERS.**—John Colton; William Rougham; Richard Pulham;

William Somersham ; John Rickingpale ; Thomas Atwood ; Thomas Bolken ; Edmund Sheriffe ; Henry Costersey ; John Barly ; Edmund Stubbs ; William Buckenham ; John Skippe ; John Sturmin ; Thomas Bacon ; John Caius.

**BENEFACTORS.**—Lady Mary Pakenham ; lady Anne Scroope ; lady Elizabeth Cleere [Clare] ; Dr. Balie ; Stephen Smith ; Richard Wilison ; Thomas Atkins ; Peter Hewit ; William Gale ; Thomas Willows ; William Sigo ; Dr. Knight ; John Whitacre.

**BISHOPS.**—1. John Colton, archbishop of Armagh. 2. John Rickingpale, bishop of Chichester. 3. William Linwood, bishop of St. David's. 4. Nicholas Shaxton, bishop of Sarum. 5. William Repps, bishop of Norwich. 6. John Skippe, bishop of Hereford.

**LEARNED WRITERS.**—William Linwood ; John Caius.

**LIVINGS IN THE GIFT OF THE COLLEGE.**—*Vide infra in Caius College.*

How this Hall came afterwards to be improved into a College shall, God willing, in due time and place be related.

Richard de Herling, Chancellor, A.D. 1351.

William Tynkel, Chancellor, 1352.

Thomas de Sutton, Chancellor, 1359.

Richard de Wetherset, *aliàs* Cambridge, Chancellor, 1360. He was by way of eminency called Richard of Cambridge ; and had many contests with the monks. He was well skilled in School-Divinity ; a racemation of which studies was now in Cambridge, but not comparable to the vintage thereof in Oxford.

Edmund de Langley, fifth son to king Edward III. was by his father created earl of Cambridge. And now that title, which formerly had travelled beyond the seas, (residing for a time with German princes,) came home, and quietly reposed itself in the British blood-royal, wherein it continued until the death of the last duke of Hamilton.

Michael de Haynton, Chancellor, A. D. 1361.

#### 34. *A Contest about choosing of Chancellor.* A.D. 1362—1369.

Michael de Causton, Chancellor. An anti-chancellor was chosen against him by an active faction in the University ; one John de Donewick, wanting nothing for that place, save a legal election. However, his party presented him to John Barnet, bishop of Ely, who confirmed him Chancellor. Whereupon Mr. John Ufford and Mr. William Rawby, in the name of the University, appealed to the official of the court of Canterbury. The official sent John Tinmouth, William Teofle, and Thomas Ely, Masters of Arts, to the bishop of Ely, inhibiting to intermeddle any more about Done-

wick, because chosen against statute. Thus was this Donewick cast out of the House for the present, for coming in by the window; who, some years after, entered in by the door of an undoubted election, and excellently discharged his office therein.

William de Gotham, Chancellor, A.D. 1366.

Thomas de Stukely, Chancellor, 1369.

**35—37. *Discords betwixt Dominicans and Carmelites. The Dominican chargeth. The Carmelite receiveth the Charge, and conquereth. A.D. 1369—1373.***

This year a tough controversy happened betwixt the Dominicans, plaintiffs, and the Carmelites, defendants, reducible to three principal heads:—

1. Which of the two Orders had the best name? The Dominicans urging it more honour to be called from a man than a mountain; an holy saint than a high heap of earth. The others rejoined, that the mountain of Carmel was more than a mountain, as sanctified by Elijah, (chief of their Order,) so conversant thereon.

2. Which was most ancient? Wherein the Dominicans pleaded seven years' seniority. And, though this may seem but a small matter, yet a race is as fairly won by a horse's head, as by a furlong distance before.

3. Who had most and strongest papal privileges? Which, being a matter of fact, depended on the producing and proving their several instruments.

Meantime the quarrels of Friars bred the quiet of Students; the gremials in the University (formerly troubled with Friars contesting with them) had now leave and leisure peaceably to follow their studies.

John de Donewick, Chancellor, A.D. 1371.

John Stokes, a Dominican, born at Sudbury, in Suffolk, but studying in Cambridge, as champion of his Order, fell foul on the Carmelites, chiefly for calling themselves "the brothers of the blessed Virgin," and then, by consequence, all know whose uncles they pretend themselves. He put them to prove their pedigree by Scripture, how the kindred came in. In brief, Bale saith, "he left red notes in the white coats of the Carmelites," he so belaboured them with his lashing language.

But John Hornbey, a Carmelite, (born at Boston, in Lincolnshire,) undertook him, called by Bale *Cornutus*, by others "Hornet-bee," so stinging his style. He proved the brotherhood of his Order to the Virgin Mary by visions, allowed true by the infallible popes, so that no good Christian durst deny it; and prevailed with the Chancellor of Cambridge, in a public writing, to

signify the superiority of their Order in this doughty difference, wherein not a hair of any important truth was concerned.

Adam Lakingheth, Chancellor, A.D. 1373.

### 38. *Chaucer a Cambridge Student.*

About this time Geoffrey Chaucer studied in Cambridge, as the writer of his Life (prefixed to the last and best edition of his Works) hath well observed. For, being commanded to give an account of himself,—\*

“What is your name? Rehearse it here I pray;  
Of whens and where, of what condition  
That ye been of; let see, come off and say,  
Faine would I know your disposicion;”

he returned, under the assumed name of *Philogenet*, “Of Cambridge clerk.” Here “clerk” is not taken in the restrictive sense, for one in Orders, (Chaucer being a military man,) but for a Scholar, skilled in learning; in which contra-distinction all men were divided, (as time into day and night,) into *clerks* and *no-clerks*. I confess, this Chaucer, living at New-Elm in Oxfordshire, “compowned his Astrolabye for the orizont of Oxenford,”† and probably studied also in that University; being one of that merit, who may with honour be acknowledged a member of both Universities.

John de Donewick, Chancellor, A.D. 1374.

William de Gotham, Chancellor, 1376.

Richard le Scroope, Chancellor, 1378.

Guido de Zouch, Chancellor, 1379.

John de Cavendish, Chancellor, 1380.

### 39—41. *A rebellious Riot of the Townsmen of Cambridge. University Monuments martyred. A.D. 1381. 5 Richard II.*

Edmund Lister, mayor of Cambridge, with the bailiffs and burghesses thereof, met in the town-house. Here they chose James Granchester and Thomas his brother into their corporation, which formerly were foreigners, and not free of the town. This done, they elected the foresaid James to be their ringleader; yet so that they bound him with an oath to do whatsoever they should command him. Now, because it is as necessary, and almost as acceptable a work, to transmit the memory of *Malefactors* to the detestation—as of *Benefactors* to the praise—of posterity, take a list of the most active townsmen in this wicked design. 1. John Blanckpain; 2. John Cotten; 3. John Marshall; 4. John Brigham; 5. John Tripplow; 6. Thomas Tryvet; 7. Peter Lolworth; 8.

\* In his “Court of Love,” fol. 352.

† In his “Astrolaby,” fol. 261.



John Cardmaker; 9. Robert Beilham; 10. John Barley; 11. Adam Serjant; 12. Henry Rand; 13. John Herre; 14. Alexander Taverner; 15. Britelin of Cambridge.\* Fifteen men, all dishonest and false, whom I may call "the field officers," under their General Granchester, if the honourable terms of "an army" may be applied to so base a company.

Then this rabble-rout rolled to Bene't College, against which foundation they had a particular quarrel, because endowed with many candle-rents in Cambridge, so that a sixth part of the town is said at that time to belong thereunto. Here they brake open the College-gates on the Saturday night, (a good preparation for the Lord's-day following,) and, as if the readiest way to pay their rent were to destroy their landlords, they violently fell on the Master and Fellows therein. From them they took all their charters, evidences, privileges, and plate to the value of fourscore pounds. Hence they advanced to the house of the Chancellor, threatening him and the University with fire and sword, (as indeed they did burn the house of William Wigmore, Esquire-Beadle, proclaiming that whosoever could catch should kill him,) except they would instantly renounce all their privileges, and bind themselves in a bond of three thousand pounds to subject themselves hereafter to the power of the townsmen, and free the townsmen from any actions, real or personal, which might arise from this occasion. This done, they went into the market-place, where with clubs they brake the seals of the University-Charters, and then burnt them in the place. One Margaret Sterr, a mad old woman, threw the ashes into the air, with these words: "Thus, thus let the learning of all scholars be confounded!"†

Now, if any ask us what is become of the originals of the Bulls of Honorius, Sergius, Eugenius, &c. of the ancient charters of Arthur, and other Briton and Saxon kings; we have but one sad and true answer to return to all their questions: "They are burnt;" and that in the worst of fires, not caused by casualty, but by malicious design. From Cambridge they went to Barnwell, doing many sacrilegious outrages to the priory therein. Nor did their fury fall on men alone, even trees were made to taste of their cruelty. In their return they cut down a curious grove called Green's-Croft, by the river's side, (the ground now belonging to Jesus College,) as if they bare such a hatred to all wood, they would not leave any to make gallows thereof for thieves and murderers. All these insolences were acted just at that juncture of time when Jack Straw and Wat Tyler played *rex* in and about London. More mischief had they done to the Scholars, had not Henry

\* CAIUS, *Hist. Cant. Acad.* lib. i. page 97.

† CAIUS, *ut prius*, page 99.



Spencer, the warlike bishop of Norwich, casually come to Cambridge with some forces, and seasonably suppressed their madness.

Guido de Zouch, Chancellor, A. D. 1382.

42, 43. *The Townsmen called to a legal Account. Their pitiful Plea.*

The time was now come that the townsmen might calmly be counted with, to answer that in cold which they had done in hot, yea, scalding, blood. Two writs are sent down from London ; the one to the mayor and bailiffs of Cambridge then being, the other to them who were mayor and bailiffs the year before, when the riot was committed. The first appeared personally, and pleaded themselves *not guilty*, not knowing of any such outrages. Edmund Lister pleaded also *not guilty*, and that he was enforced to do all that was done ; which the king's counsel quickly confuted, by producing the two bonds which they forced the Chancellor to subscribe.

Three things the townsmen desired : First. A copy of the bill. Secondly. Counsel. Thirdly. Respite to answer. To the copy of the bill it was answered, that since they had heard the same, it should suffice ; for by law they ought to have no copy.\* To Counsel, it was answered, they should have it wherein it was to be had ; but this was mere matter of fact. As for respite, after many subterfuges and dilatory pleas, at last they submitted themselves to the king's mercy, who seized the privileges of the town, as forfeited into his own hands, and conferred them on the University.

44, 45. *Privileges conferred on the University. Focalia prized by the Chancellor.*

First. That hereafter the oversight of all victuals should belong to the Chancellor ; so that no townsman ever since putteth a crumb of bread or drop of beer into his mouth, but what first is weighed and measured by an officer of the University. Secondly. That the Chancellor and the University should have power to set prices on candles, (very necessary, I assure you, to hard students,) and to license all victualling-houses, and oversee all wares and weights at Sturbridge fair. Thirdly. That no action be brought by any townsman against Scholar or Scholar's servant, save only in the Court of the Chancellor. Fourthly. That the University have power to punish and amerce all forestallers, regraters, &c. paying a rent of ten pounds a-year for that privilege into the Exchequer ; this their power extending to the town and suburbs thereof : from which clause of "suburbs" the Lord Coke collects and concludes Cambridge then to be a city in reputation.†

\* LORD COKE in the fourth part of his "Institutes," c. 44.

† *Vide ut supra.*

We must not forget that at the same time *focakia*, that is, all kind of fuel, wood, coals, turf, &c. was then subjected to the Chancellor, as to set the price thereof. Seeing the townsmen had so little wit and honesty as to make fuel of king's charters, hereafter they should meddle no more with materials for fire. Thus ill manners occasion good laws, as the handsome children of ugly parents.

John Nekton, Chancellor, A.D. 1384.

46—50. *An Order that no Scholar is to be admitted under eighteen Years of Age. The Franciscans oppose this Order. The Issue uncertain. [Beneficed Men licensed by the Pope as Non-residents.]*

The University now began to grow sensible of a great grievance, caused by the Minors or Franciscan Friars. For they surprised many, when children, into their Order, before they could well distinguish betwixt a cap and a cowl, whose time in the University ran on from their admission therein, and so they became Masters of Arts before they were masters of themselves. These University-boys, (for *men* they were not,) wanting wit to manage their degrees, insolently domineered over such who were their juniors, yet their elders. To prevent future inconveniences in this kind, the Chancellor and University made an order, that hereafter none should be admitted gremials under eighteen years of age.

The Minors or Franciscans were much nettled hereat, who traded much in such tender youth; (Minors and children agree well together;) and William Folvil, a Franciscan, wrote an invective against the Act of the University, as injurious to the privileges of this Order; it being against monastical liberty to be stinted to any age for the entrance therein.\*

I find not what was the issue of this contest, but believe that the University never retracted their order; though it stands not in force this day, wherein many of younger age are daily admitted. And seeing man's life is now shortened, it is but reason, that what we want of our ancestors in long running, we should supply in soon starting. Let the watermen of London (whose violent work requires robustious bodies) make an order in their Hall, that none under the age of eighteen should be bound apprentice in their Company: ability is more to be respected than age in the sons of the Muses, in whom often *eruditio supplet aetatem*. Nor is there to my knowledge any prohibition in this kind observed, save that they fright scholars of a low stature with a jocular tradition, that

\* *PITZÆUS, Script. Ang. in anno 1384.*

"none are to commence who are not higher than the beadle's staff."

A great schism happened this year in the regent-house, about the choice of a new Chancellor. I find not who carried the place, and therefore probably the old one still continued.

Thomas de Hetherset, Chancellor; Richard Maycent, Proctor, A. D. 1386.

Pope Urban VI. gave licence to beneficed men to be non-residents for five years, and follow their studies in the University, if allowed by the Chancellor for the same.

William Colville, Chancellor; John Wace and Richard Baston, Proctors, A. D. 1388.

### 51. *A Parliament kept at Cambridge.*

A parliament was called at Cambridge; a place at this time very convenient for that purpose. For he that will hinder the hide from rising up on either side must fix his foot on the middle thereof. Cambridge was well nigh the centre of those eastern counties, lately mutinous with popular commotions. The king for his privacy was pleased to prefer Barnwell Priory for the place of his repose, though otherwise King's Hall, founded by his grandfather, was prepared for his entertainment; where all things were so conveniently contrived, that the courtiers had all lodgings and offices by themselves, without meeting with the Scholars, save only in the passage towards the kitchen. William Courteney archbishop of Canterbury, and Edmund Langley earl of Cambridge, lodged in the convents of the Carmelites, being of the largest receipt of any Religious House in Cambridge. A sad accident happened as the king rode in state to the house: one Sir Thomas Trivet attended his majesty; which knight, being mounted on an unruly horse, was cast off, brake his entrails, and died the next day.

### 52—54. *Canterbury misprinted for Cambridge in the Statute-book.*

*The excellent Statutes of Cambridge Parliament against wandering Scholars.*

By the way, methinks Cambridge might bring an action of trespass against all our printed statute-books, for depriving her of the honour of this parliament, and rendering the place *Canterbury* instead of Cambridge, in the preface to the Acts thereof. This inconvenience cometh from contracting long words in writing, when there be two names whose faces, (as I may say,) I mean, their beginnings, are the same; and whose lower parts, though much differing,—being cut off with a dash,—causeth a confusion betwixt them. And although, by the Tower Rolls and other excellent

authors,\* this parliament appeareth kept at Cambridge, not Canterbury; yet (as if prescription turned usurpation into lawful possession) the lawyers will not amend this mistake. The best is, it matters not where good statutes be made, so they be made; the place being not essential unto them.

Many and good were the laws enacted in this parliament, besides the confirmation of those made in the reign of king Edward III. namely, that the manly and martial exercise of archery should be generally used. Secondly. A statute was made against the multitude of servants; great lords keeping then little armies in their families, which soon after occasioned the wars betwixt the Houses of York and Lancaster. And whereas it was the general complaint, that men were grown so vain and expensive in their clothes, that servants were not to be known from their masters, the clergy from the laity, something was ordered for the regulating of apparel, the wages of labourers, and removing the staple.

We must not forget, that in this parliament a statute was made also against wanderers; and particularly against Scholars of both the Universities, that they should not go about without licence from the Chancellor. Indeed, I have ever beheld begging Scholars as the most improper objects of charity; who must be vicious, or else cannot be necessitous to a mendicant condition. But, since, I have revoked my opinion; the calamities of this age falling so heavily on Scholars, that I am converted into a charitable conceit of such who beg the charity of others.

Richard de Deerham, Chancellor, A.D. 1389.

55—58. *A strange Miracle. Not like those in the Scripture. A strange Plague in Cambridge. The like after was at Oxford.*

A strange miracle is reported here to have happened: Whilst the Augustine Friars in a solemn procession were carrying the Host about the town, on a sudden it grew so heavy, that it made two of the strongest Friars puff, and sweat, and blow to support the same.† It added to the wonder, that, let any layman put his hands under it, and they felt no weight at all. Thus this was a Roman—but no Catholic—miracle, as but partial, and confined only to the cognizance of the clergy; enough almost to make it suspected, that they first feigned it who only felt it.

Surely, it is not like unto Scripture-miracles, which had all persons present witnesses to the truth thereof. Say not, “Paul only heard the voice speaking to him from heaven, which the rest of his fellow-travellers did not hear;” because that express was made par-

\* Thomas Walsingham and Henry Knighton, in their Lives of Richard II.

† THOMAS WALSHINGHAM *in hoc anno*.

ticularly for his personal conversion. Otherwise, it will be hard to instance in Scripture wherein a miracle was not evident to all who were present thereat.

This reported miracle was followed with a sad mortality in the town and University, proceeding from the infection of the air, and that caused from the unclean keeping of the streets. Indeed, I read how the Master of Michael Hostel was convented before the Chancellor, and commanded either quickly to cleanse their channels, or quite to stop them up, as being in the public passage of the Students to the Schools and St. Mary's, which sent forth such an offensive savour, (the purest brains are soonest subject to infection,) that many fell sick with the noisomeness thereof. And, indeed, the shame and guilt is great, when, for the want of sweeping the streets, the inhabitants thereof are swept away with infections. Now, such the malignity of this disease, that presently it infected the brain, so that instantly men ran raving mad, and, which was strange, starved themselves to death, refusing to eat or drink, save what was forced down their throats with violence. What number of Scholars and townsmen died hereof, is uncertain; but, sure, they were not a few, the distemper continuing for many weeks together.

I doubt not but Oxford did greatly condole with Cambridge herein, the rather, because, surely, Cambridge did sadly sympathize with her sister Oxford, when, in the reign of king Henry VII. she was made desert and desolate by an epidemical infection. This arose, saith their antiquary, *ex stagnis et aquarum obicibus*, from the stopping of water-courses, (and Oxford, I assure you, is well stored with them on her east and south side,) so that the town was wholly forsaken, till, by the care of Richard Fox their Chancellor, it slowly recovered the inhabitants.\*

59—61. *John Bromiard, a fierce Anti-Wicklivist. Both best by Turns. Statute against fugitive Friars. A.D. 1390—1396.*

Now, or about this time, John Bromiard, a Dominican,† first bred in Oxford, came to Cambridge; and there became Professor of Divinity: sent thither (perchance) on design to ferret out the Wicklivists, to whom he was a professed enemy; though Ralph Spalding, a Carmelite, was the sole eminent Cantabrigian at this time suspected to favour their opinions.‡

Note by the way, that Oxford was most fruitful of defenders and sufferers for the truth, from the coming of Wickliff till the rising of Luther; during which time Cambridge was but barren of famous confessors. But Cambridge, in the reign of king Henry VIII.

\* BRIAN TWYNE, page 324.  
† *Idem*, page 550.

† PITZÆUS, *De Script. Anglic.* page 551.

afforded more martyrs and witnesses of the truth, whilst Oxford was more generally guilty of superstition.\* Thus he who hath two fair orchards seldom wanteth fruit; the one hitting whilst the other faileth. And thus the God of truth was alternately furnished with champions, first of the one then the other University; till both at last (after the perfect Reformation) became the fruitful nurseries of Protestant worthies, to the envy and admiration of all Christendom.

William Colville, Chancellor; Thomas Hadley and Peter Skelton, Proctors, A.D. 1391.

It was usual for apostate Preaching or Dominican Friars, being fugitives from foreign parts, here surreptitiously to steal their degrees: in future prevention whereof, the king ordered, they should not *commence* in either University. He by his writ also enjoined the sheriff of Cambridgeshire, in default of the bailiffs and townsmen, to assist the Chancellor in repressing malefactors.†

John Nekton, Chancellor, A.D. 1392.

William Colville, Chancellor; Thomas Hougham, Proctor, 1394.

Eudo or Guido de Zouch, Chancellor; William Wimble, Proctor, 1396.

62, 63. *The first Person of Honour Chancellor of Cambridge. Cambridge's Chancellor no longer confirmed by Ely's Bishop.*

John Fordham, bishop of Ely, well considering the state, degree, and noble birth of Eudo de Zouch, (being, as I collect it, younger son to the first lord Zouch of Harringworth in Northamptonshire, a younger branch of most ancient barons at Ashby-de-la-Zouch in Leicestershire,) would not exact obedience of him, as of the former Chancellors. Indeed, Fordham was herein more court-like and civil to this Eudo than Thomas Arundel, his predecessor bishop of Ely, who (being nobly born himself, might be presumed more courteous to one of the like extraction, yet) seventeen years since, namely, A.D. 1379, took obedience of this Eudo, then Chancellor, in all formality. But some will say, "Eudo had since acquired (though not better blood) more gravity and degrees, and therefore more respect was due unto him."

But what now was indulged to Chancellor Zouch as a personal favour was, six years after, A.D. 1402, granted generally to all his successors, by the bounty of pope Boniface IX. who, by his Bull, ordered it, that the Chancellor of Cambridge needed not any further confirmation from the bishop of Ely, but that his election by the University put him into power to perform his office.

\* Which clearly appears by consulting and comparing Fox's "Acts and Monuments."

† ROBERT HARE, in *Archivæ*.

## SECTION IV.

ROULANDO LITTON IN PAGO HARTFORDENSI  
ARMIGERO.

PRIMAM mundi ætatem, Poetæ dixerunt *auream* ; non ob auri abundantiam, cujus ne mica tunc in usu, (cum “ opes, malorum irritamenta,” nondum effoderentur,) sed ob summam illius sæculi simplicitatem.

Quo quidem sensu, vita academica mihi verè *aurea* est censenda : cujus me meminisse juvat, cum nos olim, in Collegio Sydneyano, (ego sub auspiciis Doctoris Wardi, tu sub tutelâ Magistri Dugardi, τῶν μακαρίτων,) literis vacavimus.

At præter hanc communem cum aliis felicitatem, mihi peculiaris honor obtigit, quem idem cubiculum tibi sociavit, notissimum enim illud, “ Noscitur e socio : ” unde spero futurum, ut obscuritas mea inter collegas, beneficio contubernii tui, (tanquam notabili indice,) apud posteros illustrabitur.

1, 2. *The large Privilege of Cambridge for printing, much improved therein.* 2 Henry IV. A.D. 1400.

Richard Billingsfield, Chancellor.

Over into England about this time first came the mystery of printing ; but when first brought to Cambridge, it is uncertain. Only I hope I may without offence report what I have read in the oracle of our English law : \* “ This University of Cambridge hath power to print within the same *omnes et omnimodos libros* ; which the University of Oxford hath not.”

True it is, it was a great while before Cambridge could find out the right knack of printing, and therefore they preferred to employ Londoners therein. Thus I find a book of Robert Alynton's, called *Sophistica Principia*, printed at London by Wynand de Word, *ad usum Cantabrigiensem*, anno 1510. But some seven years after, one Sibert, University-printer, improved that mystery to good perfection, fairly setting forth the book of Erasmus, *De*

\* SIR EDWARD COKE, part iv. of his “ Institutes of the Jurisdiction of Courts,” page 228.



*conscribendis Epistolis*,\* the author then living in Cambridge, who may be presumed curious in the impression of his works. In the next age Thomas Thomasius, Fellow of King's, and Cambridge-printer, (known by the Dictionary of his name,) heightened printing to higher degree; since, exactly completed by his successors in that office; witness the Cambridge Bible, of which none exacter or truer edition in England.

3—5. *The University visited by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop's Mandate to the Chancellor. Another to every College. A Mistake in the printed Date. A.D. 1401.*

This year the University was visited by Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, the first and last of his place personally appearing in that employment. We are therefore concerned to be the more punctual in relating all passages; and begin with his letter of citation, sent to the Chancellor, being Richard de Billingford, Master of *Corpus Christi* College, though none particularly named.

*Thomas permissione, &c. dilecto filio cancellario Universitatis Cantabrigiæ, Eliensis dioceseos, nostræque provincie Cantuariensis, salutem, &c.—Quia nos in progressu visitationis nostræ metropolitice in dictâ diocesi exercendæ, vos et dictam Universitatem, annuente Domino, proponimus visitare; vos tenore præsentium peremptoriè citamus, et per vos omnes et singulos Doctores, et Magistros Regentes, et alias personas quascunque prædictæ Universitatis, qui nostræ visitationi hujusmodi interesse tenentur de consuetudine vel de jure, citari volumus; et mandamus, quod compareatis, vel compareant coram nobis in domo congregationis Universitatis prædictæ, decimo septimo die mensis Septembris proximi futuri, cum continuatione et prorogatione dierum tunc sequentium, visitationem nostram hujusmodi juxta juris exigentiam subituri, facturique ulterius et recepturi quod canonicis convenit institutis. Et quid feceritis in præmissis, nos dictis die et loco debitè certificetis per literas vestras patentes, hunc tenorem, unâ cum nominibus et cognominibus omnium et singulorum per vos in hac parte citatorum, in schedulâ eisdem literis vestris annectendâ, descriptis, habentes, sigillo vestro consignatas. Datum in manerio nostro de Lambeth, decimo octavo die mensis Augusti, anno Domini 1401, et nostræ translationis anno quinto.*

*Concordat cum originali,*

ROBERT BLEWET, *Notarius Publicus.*†

\* CAIUS, *Hist. Cant. Acad.* lib. ii. page 127.  
fol. 492.

† *Prima pars, Thom. Arundell,*



The same day several letters were sent, one to every particular College; as appeareth by the following copy, directed to Trinity Hall, (singled out, it seemeth, by itself; whose Master, a Canonist, was presumed most knowing in such legal proceedings,) which only remaineth in the register.

*Thomas, &c. in Christo filio, gardiano sive custodi Collegii Sanctæ Trinitatis Cantabrigiæ, Eliensis dioceseôs, nostræ Cantuariensis provinciæ, salutem, &c.—Quia nos in progressu visitationis nostræ metropolitice prædictæ dioceseôs, vos et Collegium vestrum in personis et rebus, annuente Domino, visitare intendimus; tenore præsentium peremptoriè vos citamus, et per vos omnes et singulos Consocios et Scholares prædicti Collegii citare volumus, et mandamus, quod compareatis; et compareant coram nobis, aut commissariis nostris, in capellâ, sive domo capitulari prædicti Collegii, decimo septimo die mensis Septembris proximè futuri, cum continuatione et prorogatione dierum tunc sequentium, visitationem hanc juxta juris exigentiam subituri, ulteriusque facturi et recepturi quod canonicis convenit institutis. Et quid feceritis in præmissis, nos aut commissarios hujusmodi dictis die et loco debitè certificetis per vestras literas patentes, hunc tenorem, unâ cum nominibus et cognominibus omnium et singulorum Sociorum et Scholarium per vos in hac parte citatorum, in schedulâ eisdem literis annectendâ, descriptis, habentes. Datum in manerio nostro de Lambeth, decimo octavo die mensis Augusti, anno Domini 1401, et nostræ translationis anno quinto.*

*Concordat cum originali,*

ROBERT BLEWET, *Notarius Publicus.*

It plainly appears, this visitation was kept A. D. 1401, by the expressed date thereof. If this may not be believed (figures being subject to mistake) of itself, it is confirmed with the coincidence of Arundel's fifth year therein. This maketh me to believe my own eyes, and a notary's hand, with the consent of chronology, before the foreign edition of "British Antiquities," \* setting this visitation later by four years, namely, 1405.

6—10. *The Occasion of this Visitation. The Archbishop comes in Pomp to Cambridge. All the Scholars appear before him. The Chancellor first examined. Several Chests in Cambridge, with their Donors.*

A word of the occasion of this visitation. William Courteney, Arundel's predecessor, some years since, had visited the University of Oxford *tam in capite quàm in membris*.† Now, that Cambridge

\* Printed at Hanaw, 1605.  
page 271.

† *Ant. Brit. (sed in Vita Thomæ Arundel.)*

should neither be elated that it was above the archbishop's power, nor dejected that it was beneath his care, but preserved in the same moderate temper with her sister Oxford, Arundel now resolved to visit the same ; the rather, because suspecting some Wicklivists, his professed adversaries, to lurk therein.

At the time appointed, September 16th, the archbishop comes to Cambridge, in so stately an equipage that he almost daunted the beholders: till the Students in Cambridge recovered themselves with a cheerful consideration,—that none of them were excluded, except by their own unworthiness, from a possibility of the like preferment ; who, though short of him in temporal extraction, might by their deserts, in due time, equal his spiritual preferment.

Next day, the Chancellor, all the Heads of Houses, with all Doctors and Masters in the University, appeared before his Grace in the Convocation-house, and there solemnly performed unto him their canonical obedience. Then the archbishop addressed himself to his work, proceeding to a strict inquiry of all persons and passages subjected to his inspection.

He began, September 17th, with the Chancellor, whom he examined singly, secretly, and *cum silentio*, on the following articles :—

1. *Imprimis*. Whether the statutes and laudable customs of the University be observed by all therein ?

2. *Item*. Whether there be any Scholars in the said University which refuse to obey the mandates and admonitions of the Chancellor ?

3. *Item*. Whether there be any disturbers of peace and unity in the said University ?

4. *Item*. Whether the common chests, with the money therein, and keys thereunto belonging, be carefully kept ?

Several well-disposed persons bestowed sums of money, and chests to treasure them in, which generally took their names from the donor thereof; or (if more contributors concurred therein) from the principal person amongst them; which may thus (all extant at this visitation) be reckoned up :—

CHEST.	DONOR.	SUM.	TIME.
BILLINGFORD'S *	Richard de Billingford.....	£100.....	A. D. 1400
BLIDE'S .....	William de Blide .....	10 marks ..	—
BLONDEL'S .....	John de Blondel, rector of Clifton, uncertain ..		—
ST. BOTOLPH'S....	Thomas of St. Botolph's .....	uncertain ..	—
DARLINGTON'S....	Darlington .....	uncertain ..	—
ELY'S †.....	John de Ely, bishop of Norwich ..	100 marks	1320
EXETER'S .....	Thomas Beaufort, duke of Exeter, uncertain ..		1401

\* CAIUS, *Hist. Cant.* lib. ii. page 133.

† So called by Caius; (because Prior of Ely;) otherwise his surname was Salmon.

CHEST.	DONOR.	SUM.	TIME.
FEN'S .....	Fen.....	uncertain..	—
GOTHAM'S .....	William de Gotham, Chancellor..	uncertain..	1376
ST. JOHN'S .....	St. John.....	uncertain..	—
LING'S .....	Richard Ling,* Chancellor of the University .....	uncertain..	1352
NEELE'S .....	Walter Neele, citizen of London ; John Whithorn, rector of Hol- sted .....	£100.....	1344
THE QUEEN'S ....	Eleanor, wife of Edward I.....	100 marks	1293
RONBERY'S .....	Gilbert Ronbery .....	uncertain..	—
ST. TRINITY'S ....	William Baytman, bishop of Ely	£100.....	1348

This money was a bank for the University, out of which any Master of Arts (especially if an University-preacher) might, on security given, borrow three pounds *gratis*, for one or more years. It seems, at the time of this visitation, the stock in them was well husbanded, which since, through negligence, is wholly lost ; though annual cofferers are chosen for key-keepers of those cabinets whose jewels are got away. But we return to the Chancellor's examination.

5. *Item.* Whether Masters, Bachelors, and Doctors formally perform their Exercises, and take their degrees according to their deserts ?

6. *Item.* Whether there be any suspected of Lollardism or any other heretical pravity ?

We well understand his language without an interpreter, meaning “such who maintain the opinions of Wickliffe.” These concealed themselves in Cambridge ; the lambs not daring to bleat when the wolf was so near. Yet some were detected now, and others afterwards. For I impute it to the influence of this visitation, that Peter Herford, Master of Arts, (probably kinsman to Nicholas Herford, who, some twenty years since, was condemned for the same opinions in Oxford,) was, ten years [after, February 22nd, enjoined an abjuration of Wickliffe's opinions, in a full Congregation in the new chapel.†

7. *Item.* Whether the Doctors dispute publicly in the Schools, how often, and when ?

Understand this of Doctors-candidates, or else of Professors, tied by their places to dispute. Otherwise, *Doctores liberi sunt*o, was not a statute as yet in force.

8. *Item.* Whether the number of Fellows be complete in Halls and Colleges, according to the will of the Founders ?

This concerned not such Colleges which in this age had statutes of diminution, to abate their Fellows in proportion to the decrease of their revenues, according to the discretion of their Masters.

\* He is called Harling in PERN's printed “Tables.”

† *Ant. Brit.* page 260.

9. *Item.* Whether any Scholars be defamed for any notorious crime, or do not profit in their studies, or hinder others from profiting therein?

10. *Item.* How the University is governed in victuals or any necessities?

To these interrogatories the Chancellor made his particular answer; and, after him, the other Doctors were examined successively and secretly; their depositions being solemnly recorded in a register in the presence of the archbishop.

11—15. *Several Colleges visited by the Archbishop's Commissioners.*

*Why Trinity Hall first visited. The Plea of the Guardian thereof; summoning none to appear out of the Province of Canterbury. An Observation.*

Now, although the archbishop personally visited the collective body of the University in the Congregation or Regent-house, it was beneath his dignity to descend to each particular foundation. For which purpose he sufficiently deputed certain commissioners, who severally surveyed every College, and began, saith the record, with the College of the Holy Trinity, called Trinity Hall at this day.

But why was this Hall first visited? It was not for the seniority thereof, being the youngest save one (Gonville Hall) in Cambridge. Was it out of respect to the name, the Holy Trinity, to whom it was dedicated? Or because the commissioners (presumed to be canonists) preferred their own faculty, as studied in the College? Or was it by casualty, the first they came to, as nearest their lodging? But the nut is not worth the cracking.

The Guardian of this College (so called in the record) appeared before the commissioners; whom, by proportion of time, we collect to be Robert Braunch, Licentiate in the Laws. He pleaded for himself, that, in obedience to the archbishop's mandates, he had summoned all the Fellows and Scholars of his College to appear accordingly, being within the province of Canterbury.

Adding moreover, *cæteros autem Socios et Scholares dicti Collegii, ab eodem Collegio tunc et nunc absentes, et in diversis remotis partibus, etiam extra dictam provinciam agentes, non citavi, nec præmunivi, prout nec potui quovis modo.*

Herein we may observe: First. That the Fellows of this House kept their places, though travelling in foreign parts, probably to perfect themselves in canon and civil law. Secondly. That his answer was well resented, finding nothing in the records returned in dislike thereof.

16—19. *Clare Hall visited, and Corpus Christi College, and the White Canons.*

Hence the commissioners stepped into the next College, of Clare Hall, and visited it *in capellâ ejusdem Collegii*, saith the record. Wherefore when Doctor Caius telleth us that *sacellum additum in hujus aulae complementum, anno 1535,\** he is not thus to be understood, as if Clare Hall was without a chapel until that year; but that their chapel (probably decayed with age, or some casualty) was in this year rebuilt, and added thereunto.

Then they visited the College of the Annunciation of the Blessed Mary, (now commonly called *Corpus Christi* College,) in the chapel thereof, namely, in the place which now is the chancel of Bene't Church.

Hence they advanced to the White Canons, over-against Peter House, where the name remaineth at this day; whom they visited in their church, (now buried in its churchyard, and the churchyard in oblivion,) observing all solemn formalities.

Let a wiser man satisfy the reader, why no other convents in Cambridge were visited by the archbishop. Had not the White Friars (the Carmelites) as much need of scouring as the White Canons? Were not spots to be found as well in cowls of other colours, Black and Grey, Benedictines and Franciscans? It is hard to conceive these Friars too high to be reached by the legative power of the archbishop, though these last Orders had the largest privileges conferred upon them by the pope.

20—22. *A Day of Non-term with the Visitors. Radegund Nuns visited. Their Visitation ended.*

It was now but crossing the street to Peter House; but, it being late, and the commissioners well wearied, they returned and reposed themselves in their lodgings. The day following, September 18th, was all vacation with them; we finding nothing by them performed; probably either because the Lord's-day, or because taken up in entertainments.

Next day, September 19th, the Commissioners visited the priory of St. Radegund, in the chapter-house thereof: where the prioress, (as the record calleth her,) and the nuns, present their several obedience; whose examinations and the depositions were entered into a register for that purpose. We charitably presume them chaster at this time than they appeared afterwards, when turned out for their incontinency, and their house turned into Jesus College.

In the afternoon they made quick dispatch, (supper being provided for the archbishop at Ely,) visiting Michael House, St.

\* *Hist. Cant. lib. i. pp. 57, 58.*

John's Hospital of Regulars, (since translated into St. John's College,) Peter's College, and Pembroke Hall, in their several chapels; and then his Grace took his journey towards Ely, where he was well welcomed by John Fordham, the bishop thereof.

*23—25. Query, about Omissions of the Commissioners. Hostels why not visited. Reformation remitted to the Archbishop's Leisure.*

Some will wonder, no mention in this visitation of Gonville Hall, (the puisne House in Cambridge,) as if so late and little, that the commissioners did oversee it. More will admire at the omission of King's Hall, (the largest and richest foundation in Cambridge,) enough to make some suspect that royal foundation subjected only to the immediate visiting of the king their patron.

As for Hostels, the wonder is not so great, why those commissioners stooped not down to visit them: First. Because dependent Hostels were, no doubt, visited in and under those Colleges to which they did relate. Absolute Hostels, which stood by themselves, being all of them unendowed, by consequence, had no considerable statutes, the breach whereof was the proper subject of this visitation. Besides, the graduates therein may be presumed, for their personal demeanours, visited in the collective body of the University.

But when this visitation was ended, it was but begun in effect, seeing such faults which, on examination, were discovered therein, were remitted to the archbishop's reformation at his own leisure; as one of his successors\* in the see (but of a different religion) hath informed us. Yet no great matter of moment appears in his register, (save the augmentation of the commons of Trinity Hall, whereof before,) which I have carefully perused, by the courteous leave of Master Sherman of Croydon, the register of them; to whose kindness I am much indebted. For, may my candle go out in a stench, when I will not confess whence I have lighted it.

*26, 27. Query: What now became of Cambridge's ancient Exemptions? A probable Conjecture.*

Some will say, "Where were now the privileges of the pope, exempting Cambridge from archi-episcopal jurisdiction?" I conceive they are even put up in the same chest with Oxford privileges, pretending to as great immunities: I mean, that the validity of them both, though not cancelled, was suspended for the present. If it be true, that the legate *de Latere* hath in some cases equal power with the pope, whom he represents; and if it be true, which

\* MATTHEW PARKER, in *Ant. Brit.* page 274.

some bold canonists aver, that none may say to the pope, *Cur ita facis*? it was not safe for any in that age to dispute the power of Thomas Arundel.

But possibly the Universities willingly waved their papal privileges: and if so, *injuria non fit volentibus*. I find something sounding this way, how the Scholars were aggrieved, that, the supreme power being fixed in their Chancellor, there lay no appeal from him, (when injurious,) save to the pope alone. Wherefore the Students, that they might have a nearer and cheaper redress, desired to be eased of their burdensome immunities, and submitted themselves to archi-episcopal visitation.\*

Richard de Deerham, Chancellor.

28—30. *Oxford Argentine challengeth all Cambridge. An Account of his Achievements, (after Prose,) now in Verse. A.D. 1407.*

This year a strange accident (if true) happened; and take it as an Oxford antiquary† is pleased to relate it unto us: one John Argentine, a Scholar of Oxford, came and challenged the whole University of Cambridge to dispute with him; as is reported in William of Worcester, the trumpeter, it seems, to this doubtful‡ champion. I can say little to the matter, only this: As for William Worcester's avouching his acts, he appeared neither in Bale's nor Pitt's Catalogues of illustrious Authors: only the latter hardly recovereth him in his appendix, (confessing himself ignorant of the age he lived in,) not mentioning the title of the book cited by the antiquary, by whom the achievements of this Argentine (though no doubt in themselves very whole and entire) are but lamely delivered, according to the tenor ensuing:—

First. Master Twyne saith of him: *Ausus erat solus*, “He alone challenged” to dispute with all Cambridge; which might be true; and still as true of him as of Phaëton,

*Magnis tamen excidit ausis.*

But he proceeds to tell us, that his performances herein may easily be understood out of William Worcester,§ in whom thus it is written:—*Actus Magistri Johannis Argentin publicè habitus in Universitate Cantabrigiæ, contra omnes Regentes hujus Universitatis, quoad Oppositiones, in anno Christi 1407.* “The Act of John Argentin, publicly kept in the University of Cambridge, against all the Regents of this University, as to oppositions, anno 1407.”

\* *Ant. Brit. in Wil. Courtney.*

† BRIAN TWYNE, *Ant. Acad. Oxon.*

page 335.

‡ Query: Does Fuller intend this word to convey the meaning of *doubtful*, or of *doughty*? The latter word occurs with its usual orthography, in a preceding page, 82.—EDIT.

§ BRIAN TWYNE, page *ut prius*, lined 32.



Let froward spirits, who delight in contesting, cavil at the doubtfulness of the pronoun, *Hujus Universitatis*, which might relate to the University of Oxford, where Master Twyne met with the manuscript of this William Worcester; and then the sense will be, that John Argentine, being a Cambridge-man, (of which name a worshipful family then flourished at Horseheath, within ten miles of Cambridge,\* ) did in Cambridge keep an Act in Opposition to all Oxford-men, who commonly at the Commencement repair thither. I say, let such as delight in cavilling turn the tables by this sleight; † whilst I can willingly allow Argentine an Oxonian, and his daring Act kept at Cambridge. Only I add, that the words of Worcester barely import the boldness of his challenge, no bravery of his conquest; not acquainting us with any great applause ensuing thereupon.

Having done with the prose, Master Twyne proceeds to the poetry, of this performance; whose words are these:—*Tum ipsius cantiones subjungit, cum hoc exordio,—*

*Non sis turba regens nostros tacitura per annos.*

*Et hoc quoque epilogo,—*

*Et velit huc conferre pedem sacra turba regentum,  
Ut ferat an motis socium bene carmina nervis.*

*Hæc Gulielmus Worcestrensis.*

Still we are in the twilight, it being again questionable to whom the pronoun *ipsius* doth relate. If to Argentine, he was both the Achilles and Homer of his own praise; and then the less credit is to be given to his own relation. But if *ipsius* (which is more proper and probable) refers to William Worcester, I wonder that Master Twyne (privileged, no doubt, to peruse the whole poem) gives us only the beginning and end thereof; or, if you will, the prologue and epilogue of this tragi-comedy. It leaveth it suspicious that the intermediate verses had no great matters of moment of this champion's performance, because passed over in silence. But I will not blast his victorious bays. Let Argentine be challenger, combatant, and conqueror; sure I am, when he came to Cambridge, he left many behind him at Oxford of more learning, who did smile at—and [of more] modesty, who did blush for—his bold undertaking. Only I wonder that this scholar-errant, after his return from *his great adventures*, was not wedded to some fair lady: I mean, that he got no great preferment; I never after finding this

\* CAMDEN'S *Britannia in Cambridgeshire*.

† Though Fuller thus humorously abandons the preceding conjecture, (that John Argentine was a member of the University of Cambridge,) yet it assumes the semblance of great probability, from the circumstance, that a person of the same name is recorded by Fuller, in a subsequent page, (110,) as the sixth Provost of King's College.—EDIT.

man, so much meriting, advanced in church or commonwealth. But, enough of this great champion; his bare memory being able to affright my single self, who, when alive, durst challenge a whole University.

Eudo de Zouch, third time Chancellor, A.D. 1412.

31. *The Chancellor sent to Rome.* 1 Henry V. A.D. 1413.

Richard de Billingsford, Chancellor. He obtained many privileges for the University. He was sent from the king, with the bishop of Ely, and Chancellor of Oxford, to Rome,\* to tell the two popes, striving for the place, that, except one would yield, England would acknowledge obedience to neither. In Billingsford's absence, Friar Thomas Ashwell is called "President of the University." A statute this year was made for wearing hoods, either of budge or lambs' skin.

Stephen de Scroope, Doctor of Law, Chancellor, A.D. 1414.

John de Rikendale, Rikengale, Rikenpale, (so many ways his name is written,) Chancellor, A.D. 1415. He was afterward bishop of Chichester.

32—34. *The Original of Vice-Chancellors. Thomas Markant's excellent Book, lost and found, lost and found, lost.* A.D. 1417.

Henry Stockton, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Ferhill and Thomas Markant, Proctors.

The Chancellors of Cambridge being lately either persons of noble birth or great employment, whose occasions often caused their absence, it was fashionable henceforward to substitute Vice-Chancellors in their room.

Thomas Markant, the junior Proctor, was Fellow of Peter House, and a great lover of antiquity: he gave a book to the University, of his own collection, concerning the privileges thereof. This, though by the will of the donor carefully kept in a locked chest, was lost by negligence, or purloined by dishonesty, till, falling into the hands of Master Robert Hare, that great antiquary, it was restored to the University.

Since, it hath been lost again, when Master Matthew Wren, since bishop of Ely, casually going into Sussex, found it in a friend's house, and (being a great preserver of ancient monuments) carefully procured the solemn restitution thereof. "But who can stay that which will away?" I am informed it is lost again; which third relapse I suspect mortal—that the book will never be recovered to the University.

\* M. S. Matthew Wren.

**35—37. *Difference betwixt the University and Londoners. The Original of Sturbridge-fair. Sale of the Privileges thereof seasonably prevented.***

A difference happening betwixt the University and the city of London, about the oversight of victuals, measures, and weights, in Sturbridge-fair, the care of all three, *pendente lite*, was referred to Sir William Asenhull, knight, High Sheriff of Cambridgeshire.\* I find not the issue of the contest.

This Sturbridge-fair is so called from Stur, a little rivulet (on both sides whereof it is kept) on the east of Cambridge; whereof this original is reported:—A clothier of Kendal, a town charactered to be *lanificii gloriâ, et industriâ præcellens*,† casually wetting his cloth in that water in his passage to London, exposed it there to sale, on cheap terms, as the worse for the wetting; and yet, it seems, saved by the bargain. Next year he returned again, with some other of his townsmen, proffering drier and dearer cloth to be sold; so that within few years hither came a confluence of *buyers, sellers, and lookers-on*, which are the three principles of a fair. In memorial whereof, Kendal-men challenge some privilege in that place, annually choosing one of the town to be chief, before whom an antic sword was carried with some mirthful solemnities; disused of late, since these sad times, which put men's minds into more serious employment.

It is at this day the most plentiful of wares in all England; (most fairs in other places being but markets in comparison thereof;) being an amphibion, as well going on ground, as swimming by water, by the benefit of a navigable river. Nothing else have I to observe hereof, save that, in the last year of queen Mary, the University, necessitated for money, were about to contract with the townsmen, for a small sum, to sell unto them all the privileges in that fair; had not Dr. Robert Brassey, Provost of King's, by the stout denying of his consent, preserved the same to the University.‡

**38—40. *A beneficial Grant to University-men, refused by their own Folly; but, on second Thoughts, accepted.***

A synod being kept at London, Robert Gilbert, Warden of Merton College, Doctor of Divinity, in the behalf of Oxford; and Thomas Kington, Doctor of Law, Advocate of the Arches, in the behalf of Cambridge;§ made two eloquent orations, that the worth of scholars in the University might be rewarded, and preferment

\* ROBERT HARE, *in archivis*.

† CAMDEN'S *Britannia* in Westmoreland.

‡ D. HATCHER'S M.S. of the Provosts of King's College.  
Hen. Chicheley.

§ *Ex registro Cantuar.*

proportioned to their deserts. Hereupon it was ordered, that the patrons of vacant benefices should bestow them hereafter on such as were graduated in the University, *gradus et professionis ratione juxta beneficiorum census et valores habitâ*. So that the best and most livings should be collated on those of the best and highest Degrees.

Dr. Kington, returning to Cambridge, instead of thanks, which he might justly have expected for his successful industry, found that the favour he procured was not accepted of. The Regent-Masters in the Congregation, out of their youthful rashness, rejected the kindness merely out of spleen and spite, because the Doctors would be served with the first and best livings, and the refuse only fall to their share.\*

John Rikendale, Rikengale, Rikenpale, Chancellor, A.D. 1419.

The Regent-Masters, being grown older and wiser, were persuaded to accept the proffer, sending their thanks by the Chancellor to another synod now kept at London. And now, when the bestowing of benefices on University-men was clearly concluded, the unlearned Friars (whose interest herein was much concerned) mainly stickled against it, until, by the king's interposing, they were made to desist.† The same year it was ordered in parliament, that none should practise physic or surgery, except approved on by one of the Universities.‡

Thomas de Cobham, Chancellor, A.D. 1422.

Robert Fitzhugh, Master of King's Hall, Chancellor, afterward bishop of London, 1423.

Marmaduke Lumley, Chancellor, afterwards bishop of Lincoln, 1428.

William Wimble, Chancellor, 1429.

John Holebrook, Chancellor, 1430.

41—43. *Differences betwixt the Bishop of Ely and the University, remitted by the Pope to the Prior of Barnwell. The Pope giveth his Sentence for Cambridge's Exemption.* 9 Henry VI. A.D. 1431.

Difference arising betwixt the University, and Philip Morgan, bishop of Ely, pope Martin V. at the instance of the University, appointed the Prior of Barnwell, and John Deeping, Canon of Lincoln, his delegates, to inquire of the privileges of the University.

The Prior undertook the whole business, examined seven witnesses, all aged, (some past threescore and ten,) and perused all

\* *Ant. Brit.* page 278.  
*Archivis.*

† *Idem, ut prius.*

‡ ROBERT HARE, in

papal Bulls, privileges and charters; wherein he found that the Chancellors of Cambridge have all ecclesiastical jurisdiction (namely, excommunication and suspension) over scholars and their servants, probates of Wills, granting of administration, and taking their accounts;\* the aged witnesses deposing it on their own sight and knowledge.

This being returned by the Prior, pope Martin pronounced his sentence, wherein he declareth, that the University, time out of mind, was in the possession, use, and exercise of ecclesiastical and spiritual jurisdiction, without any disquieting of archbishops, bishops, or their officers: and for the time to come he confirmed their immunities,† which his successor, Eugenius IV. re-confirmed unto them. This strengthens our former conjecture, that the University willingly receded from their own privileges in Arundel's visitation.

William Lassel's, Chancellor, A. D. 1431.

Richard Caudrey, Chancellor, 1432.

#### 44. *A constant Tenure of princely Earls.*

John de Langton, Chancellor, A. D. 1436.

Richard duke of York was at this time earl of Cambridge; the last that ware that honour for many years, in whose death it was extinct. And now let the reader at one view behold the great persons dignified with the earldom of Cambridge:—SCOTCH KINGS.—1. David. 2. Henry. 3. Malcolm. GERMAN PRINCES.—4. John earl of Hainault. 5. William marquess of Juliers. ENGLISH DUKES.—6. Edmund of Langley, fifth son to Edward III. 7. Edward his son. 8. Richard duke of York, his brother, father to king Edward IV. No city, town, or place in England was ever honoured with so many and great persons as Cambridge was; whose earldom, sleeping for almost two hundred years, was at last conferred by king James on the royally-extracted marquess Hamilton; whereof in due place.

#### 45, 46. *The University's Money embezzled. Never restored to the same Degree. Vehement Suspicion of Corruption.*

About this time the many chests of money (formerly well-filled, and worthily employed for the good of the University and eminent scholars therein) were squandered away, and embezzled to private men's profit. I cannot particularize in their names, nor charge any single person: but it appeared too plainly, that, of fourteen or fifteen chests, not four were left, and the sums in them inconsiderable; so that Cambridge never recovered her bank, nor

\* ROBERT HARE, in *Archivis*, vol. ii. fol. 103.

† *Idem*, vol. ii. fol. 115.

recruited her chests to the former proportion. Yet afterwards she met with two good benefactors, the one Thomas Bouchier, archbishop of Canterbury, who bestowed on her an hundred pounds; the other the Lady Elizabeth Cleere, duchess of Norfolk, which put the University in stock again, bestowing no less than a thousand marks at several times on the public treasury; though within few years little was left thereof.

I know it is pleaded, that the expensive suits of the University against the townsmen in the reigns of king Henry VII. and king Henry VIII. much exhausted their coffers. But when all is audited, a strong suspicion still remains on some, in public employment, of unjust dealing. Sure it is, in the reign of king Edward VI. the treasury was so empty, it wanted wherewith to defray necessary and ordinary expenses.

---

## SECTION V.

RADULPHO FREEMAN, IN COMITATU HERTFORD ENSI  
ARMIGERO.

SOLON interrogatus a Cræso regum opulentissimo, quem ille mortalium agnosceret beatissimum, Tellum quendam Atheniensem civem privatum nominavit.\* Huic res nec augusta, nec angusta; cum inter invidiam et inopiam pari ferè distantia collocaretur.

Si Solon nunc in vivis, te felicissimis hujus sæculi annumeraret; cui mens composita, corpus (licet tenue) integrum, domus elegans, supellex nitida, patrimonium satis amplum, soboles numerosa ac ingenua.

Nec nimis titulis tumescis, nec te obscuritas premit, cui talis obtigit conditio quâ melior haud faciliè fingi potest.

Quod si tibi suppetat hora succisiva, quæ non sit fraudi senioribus tuis negotiis, perlegas, quæso, hanc Historiæ meæ portiunculam, cujus pars majuscula in Collegio Regali describendo consumitur; in quo (ut accepi) tu olim litteris incubuisti.

\* PLUTARCHUS in *Vitâ Solonis*.

1—3. *Cambridge Fens endeavoured to be drained. All in vain.*  
*Arguments pro and con Fen-draining. A.D. 1436.*

About this time, (for I cannot attain the certain year,) some considerable persons of our nation undertook the draining of the fens near to Cambridge. They wanted not Dutchmen out of the Low Countries to assist them, where each peasant is born a pioneer; and vast sums were expended in making of ditches and banks, impregnable (as conceived) against all assaults of inundation.

But in the next (being a wet and windy) winter, down comes *the bailiff of Bedford*, (so the country-people commonly call the overflowing of the river Ouse,) attended, like a person of his quality, with many servants, (the accession of tributary brooks,) and breaks down all their paper-banks, as not water-shot-free, reducing all to the former condition.

This accident put the wits of that and succeeding ages, upon the dispute of the feasibility of the design: and let us sum up the arguments *against* and *for* this undertaking.

ARGUMENT.

I.—SOME objected, that God saith to the water, "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further," Job xxxviii. 11. It is therefore a trespass on the Divine prerogative for man to presume to give other bounds to the water, than what God hath appointed. Even the Heathen man was so Christian as to say, *Rebus Divinitus constitutis manus non est injicienda.\**

II.—Many have attempted, but not effected, it. None ever wrestled with it, but it gave them a foil, if not a fall, to the bruising, if not breaking, of their backs. Many have burnt their fingers in these waters; and, instead of draining the fens, emptied their own estates. It hath been almost as unsuccessful, as the letting of the Red into the

ANSWER.

I.—THE argument holdeth in application to the ocean, which is a wild horse, only to be broken, backed, and bridled by Him who is the Maker thereof. But it is a false and a lazy principle, if applied to fresh waters; from which human industry may [rescue] and hath rescued many considerable parcels of ground.

II.—Many men's undertaking thereof insinuates the possibility of the project. Otherwise, it is unlikely so many discreet persons would befool themselves in seeking what is not to be found. The failing is not in the unfeasibility of the design, but in the accidental defaults of the undertakers, wanting either heads, (discretion,) or hearts, (resolu-

\* PAUSANIAS, in *Corinth*.



## ARGUMENT.

Midland Sea, to the kings of Egypt who endeavoured it.

III.—Morton, bishop of Ely, (one of the wealthiest who ever sate in that See,) almost wasted his estate, by cutting a water-passage, (known by the name of the New Leam,) and well nigh beggared himself, in hope to enrich his town of Wisbeach with trading thereby.

IV.—An alderman of Cambridge (chosen a burgess in parliament) affirmed the Fens to be like a crust of bread swimming in a dish of water. So that under eight or ten feet earth, it is nothing but mere water. Impossible therefore the draining thereof, if surrounded by that liquid element both above and beneath.

V.—The river Grant or Cam, (call it as you please,) running by Cambridge, will have its stream dried up by the draining of the Fens. Now, as Cambridge is concerned in its river; so that whole county, yea, this whole kingdom, is concerned in Cambridge. No reason, therefore, that private men's particular profit should be preferred before an universal good, or good of an University.

VI.—The Fens, preserved in their present property, afford great plenty and variety of fish and fowl, which here have their

## ANSWER.

tion,) or hands, (assistants,) or purses,—performance of pay,—to people employed therein.

III.—It is confessed a burden too heavy for the back of any single person, how great soever. And therefore it calls for a corporation of wise and wealthy persons to undertake the same.

IV.—Interest betrayed his judgment to an evident error. And his brains seemed rather to swim, instead of this floating earth. For, such as have sounded, as I may say, the depth of that ground, find it to be *terra firma*, and no doubt as solid to the centre as any other earth in England.

V.—It is granted, the water by Cambridge kindles and keeps in the fire therein. No hope of sufficient fuel on reasonable rates, except care be taken for preserving the river navigable, which may be done, and the Fens drained nevertheless. To take away the thief is no wasting or weakening to the wick of the candle. Assurance may be given, that no damage shall redound to the stream of Grant, by stopping other superfluous waters.

VI.—A large first—makes recompence for the shorter second—course at any man's table. And who will not prefer a tame

## ARGUMENT.

seminaries and nurseries; which will be destroyed on the draining thereof; so that none will be had, but at excessive prices.

VII.—The Fens afford plenty of sedge, turf, and reed; the want whereof will be found, if their nature be altered.

VIII.—Many thousands of poor people are maintained by fishing and fowling in the Fens, who will all be at a loss of livelihood, if their barns be burnt, that is, if the Fens be drained.

IX.—Grant the Fens drained with great difficulty, they will quickly revert to their old condition, like to the Pontine Marshes in Italy.† This disease of the dropsy (if *aqua super cutem*, as well as *intercutis*, may be so called) will return to the Fens again.

X.—Grant them drained, and so continuing; as now the great fishes therein prey on the less, so then wealthy men would de-

## ANSWER.

sheep before a wild duck, a good fat ox before a well-grown eel?

VII.—The commodities are inconsiderable to balance the profit of good grass and grain, which those grounds, if drained, would produce. He cannot complain of wrong who hath a suit of buckram taken from him, and one of velvet given in lieu thereof. Besides, provision may be made, that a sufficiency of such ware-trash\* may still be preserved.

VIII.—It is confessed, that many whose hands are becramped with laziness, live (and only live, as never gaining any estates) by that employment. But such, if the Fens were drained, would quit their idleness, and betake themselves to more lucrative manufactures.

IX.—If a patient, perfectly cured, will be careless of his health, none will pity his relapse. Moderate cost, with constant care, will easily preserve what is drained; the Low Countries affording many proofs thereof.

X.—Oppression is not essential either to draining or enclosing, though too often a concomitant of both. Order may be

\* This compound word does not convey the idea, that the *trash*—"sedge, turf, and reed"—is an article for sale. But it here seems descriptive of the small pieces of wood, sedge, turf, &c. which are collected in vast quantities at the head of every *weir* or *weir*, when the river is low.—EDIT.

† CAMDEN'S *Britannia* in Cambridge-

## ARGUMENT.

your the poorer sort of people. Injurious partage would follow upon the enclosures, and rich men, to make room for themselves, would justle the poor people out of their commons.

## ANSWER.

taken by commissioners of quality, empowered for that purpose, that such a proportion of commons may be allotted to the poor, that all private persons may be pleased, and an advance accrue thereby to the commonwealth.

However, the generality of people in that age was possessed with a firm opinion, the project was utterly impossible to be brought to pass.

4—10. *Since effected to Admiration. Labor improbus omnia vincit. Cambridge why jealous herein ; never pleased. Deep Philosophy. A real Refutation. Cambridge Air bettered.*

But the best argument to prove that a thing may be done, is actually to do it. The “undertakers” in our present age have happily lost their first name in a far better of “performers ;” and of late the Fens nigh Cambridge have been adjudicated drained, and so are probable to continue.

Very great was the ingenuity, industry, (the eyes and hands of all grand designs,) and expense in this action. For the river Ouse, formerly lazily loitering in its idle intercourses with other rivers, is now sent the nearest way (through a passage cut by admirable art) to do its errand to the German Ocean.

I confess, Cambridge ever looked on the draining of the Fens with a jealous eye, as a project like to prove prejudicial unto them. And within my memory, an eminent preacher made a smart sermon before the Judges of the Assizes on this text: “Let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream,” Amos v. 24 ; wherein he had many tart reflections on the draining of the Fens, inciting the Judges to be tender of the University so much concerned therein. But, it seems, Cambridge was then more frightened than since it hath been hurt, now the project is effected.

The chiefest complaint I hear of is this,—that the country thereabout is now subject to a new drowning, even to a deluge and inundation of plenty ; all commodities being grown so cheap therein. So hard it is to please froward spirits, either full or fasting.

Here even a serious body cannot but smile at their conceit, who *so confidently* have reported and believed, that the late drought,

these last three years, proceeded from the draining of the Fens. As if the sun, arising in those eastern counties, were offended that he was disappointed of his morning's draught, (which he formerly had out of the Fens,) and now wanteth vapours, the materials of rain, whereof those moist grounds afforded him plenty before.

A jejune and narrow conceit: as if the cockle-shell of Fen-waters were considerable to quench the thirst of the sun, who hath the German Ocean to carouse in at pleasure. Besides, their fond fancy is confuted by the wetness of this last summer, affording rain enough, and too much.

As Cambridgeshire hath gotten more earth, so hath it gained better air, by the draining of the Fens. And Cambridge itself may soon be sensible of this perfective alteration. Indeed, Athens, the staple of ancient learning, was seated in a morass, or fenny place, (and so Pisa, an academy in Italy,) and the grossness of the air is conceived, by some, to quicken their wits and strengthen their memories. However, a pure air, in all impartial judgments, is to be preferred for students to reside in.

11—14. *King Henry foundeth a small College, and William Bingham another. Both united and enlarged into King's College. The admirable Chapel. A.D. 1442, 3.*

Henry VI. a pious and mild prince, (one of a better soul than spirit,) erected a small College for a Rector and twelve Scholars in and about the places where Augustine's Hostel, God's House, and the church of St. Nicholas, formerly stood; \* being one motive that he dedicated this his foundation to the honour of St. Nicholas, on whose day, February 12th, also he was born.

William Bingham, rector of St. John Zachary's, in London, sensible of the great want of grammarians in England in that age, founded a little Hostel, (contiguous to king Henry's College,) to be governed by a Proctor; and twenty-five Scholars, all to be (not boys, learning the rules—but) men studying the criticisms—of grammar:† and he is no grammarian, who knoweth not *grammaticus* (in that age especially) to be an essential member of an University.

But, the year after, Bingham's small Hostel was swallowed up in the king's foundation, (not as Ahab's palace ate up Naboth's vineyard, but) by the full and free consent of the aforesaid Bingham, surrendering it up, July 10th, into the hands of the king, for the improving and perfecting thereof. Whereupon the king, uniting and enlarging them both with the addition of the church of St. John Zachary, then belonging to Trinity Hall, (in lieu whereof, he

\* CAIUS, *Hist. Cant.* lib. i. pp. 6, 7.

† *Idem*, *ibidem*.

who would do hurt to none, good to all, gave to that Hall the patronage of St. Edward's in Cambridge,) founded one fair College, for one Provost, seventy Fellows and Scholars, three Chaplains, six Clerks, sixteen Choristers, and a Master over them, sixteen Officers of the foundation, besides twelve Servitors to the senior Fellows, and six poor Scholars; amounting in all to a hundred and forty.

The chapel in this College is one of the rarest fabrics in Christendom, wherein the stone-work, wood-work, and glass-work contend which most deserve admiration. Yet the first generally carrieth away the credit, (as being a stone-henge indeed,) so geometrically contrived, that voluminous stones mutually support themselves in the arched roof, as if art had made them to forget nature, and weaned them from their fondness to descend to their centre. And yet, though there be so much of Minerva, there is nothing of Arachne in this building: I mean, not a spider appearing, or cobweb to be seen on the (Irish-wood or cedar) beams thereof. No wonder, then, if this chapel, so rare a structure, was the work of three succeeding kings;—Henry VI. who founded—VII. who fathered—VIII. who finished—it. The whole College was intended [to be] conformable to the chapel; but the untimely death (or rather deposing) of king Henry VI. hindered the same. Thus foundations partake of their founder's interest, and flourish or fade together. Yea, that mean Quadrant (now almost all the College extant at this day) was at first designed only for the Choristers.

### 15. *A Catalogue of King's College Worthies.*

But the honour of Athens lieth not in her walls, but in the worth of her citizens. Building may give lustre, but learning life, to a College; wherein we congratulate the happiness of this foundation. Indeed, no College can continue in a constant level of learning, but will have its alternate depressions and elevations: but in this we may observe a good tenor of able men in all Faculties, as indeed a good artist is left-handed to no profession. See here their catalogue, wherein such persons reducible to two or more columns, to avoid repetition, are entered in that capacity wherein I conceive them to be most eminent.

PROVOSTS.—1. William Millington, elected, *anno* 1443, from Clare Hall, whither, after three years, he was remanded, for his factious endeavouring to prefer his countrymen of Yorkshire. 2. John Chedworth, who continued six years. 3. Richard Woodlark, D.D. founder of Catherine Hall. 4. Walter Field, D.D. elected 1479, continued twenty years. 5. John Dogget, D.C.L. Chancellor of *Sarum*, elected 1499, and remained so two years. 6. John Argen-

tine, D.P. and D. He gave the College a fair bason and ewer of silver, with other plate, yet in the use and custody of the Provost. Elected 1501, and remained six years. 7. Richard Hutton, D.C.L. elected 1507, continued two years. 8. Robert Hacomblen, D.D. elected 1509, and remained nineteen years. He wrote comments on Aristotle's Ethics. 9. Edward Fox, afterward bishop of Hereford, elected 1528, and continued ten years. 10. George Day, afterward bishop of Chichester, elected 1538, and continued ten years. 11. Sir John Cheke, (of St. John's, in Cambridge,) chosen by mandate, 1548, sate five years. 12. Richard Atkinson, D.D. elected 1553, so remained three years. 13. Robert Brassey, chosen 1556, and so remained two years. 14. Philip Barker, chosen 1558, sate twelve years. 15. Roger Goad, a grave and reverend divine, of whom much hereafter; elected 1570, and remained Provost forty years. He gave the rectory of Milton in Cambridgeshire to the College. 16. Fog Newton, D.D. chosen 1610, sate two years. 17. William Smith, chosen 1612, two years. 18. Samuel Collins, chosen 1615; of whom hereafter.

**BENEFACTORS.**—1. William Towne, Fellow, gave four pounds for ever, for a salary to a minister. 2. John Plentith, Fellow, gave one hundred and sixty marks. 3. William Wiche, Fellow, gave many of his books to, &c. 4. William Skelton, D.P. Fellow, gave all his books to the library. 5. Nicholas West, when Scholar of this House, so desperately turbulent, that, discontented with the loss of the Proctorship, he endeavoured to fire the Provost's lodgings; and, having stolen some silver spoons, departed the College. Afterward he became a new man, D.D. and bishop of Ely; who, to expiate his former faults, gave many rich gifts and plate to the College, and built part of the Provost's lodgings. 6. William Scales, Fellow, D.D. gave a salary, known by his name at this day. 7. Dr. Cowel gave plate and divers books to the College. 8. William Smith, Provost, gave a hundred pounds' worth of books, and a fair salt of forty pounds' price, with other legacies. 9. Adam Robins, Richard Day, and William Henshaw, late Fellows, contributed their several benefactions. 10. Thomas Weaver, late Fellow, wainscoted both sides of the choir in a decent manner.

**BISHOPS.**—1. Nicholas Cloose, bishop of Carlisle, and of Lichfield, 1451. 2. John Chedworth, bishop of Lincoln, 1452. 3. Thomas Rotherham, bishop of Rochester first, then York, 1467. 4. Oliver King, bishop of Exeter, then Bath and Wells, 1492. 5. Geoffrey Blith, 1503, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield. 6. Nicholas West, 1515, bishop of Ely. 7. Nicholas Hawkins, 1533, nominated bishop of Ely, but died before his consecration. In time of famine, he sold all his plate and goods to relieve the

poor of Ely, where he was served himself in wooden dishes and earthen pots. 8. Thomas Goodrich, 1534, bishop of Ely. 9. Edward Fox, 1535, bishop of Hereford. 10. Robert Aldrich, 1537, bishop of Carlisle. Erasmus styleth him, when young, *Blandæ eloquentiæ juvenem*. 11. George Day, 1543, bishop of Chichester. 12. John Poinet, 1550, bishop of Rochester, then Winchester. 13. Richard Cox, 1559, bishop of Ely, Scholar of this House. 14. Edmund Gwest, 1559, bishop of Rochester, then Sarum. 15. William Alley, 1560, bishop of Exeter. 16. William Wickham, 1595, bishop of Lincoln, then Winchester. 17. Thomas Ram, bishop of Ferns in Ireland. 18. Richard Mountague, 1628, bishop of Chichester, then Norwich. 19. John Long, bishop of Armagh, some thirty years since; not finding the date of his consecration. 20. William \* Murray, Conduct of this College, bishop of Landaff, *anno* 1627.

STATESMEN.—1. W. Hatliffe, D.D. Secretary to king Edward IV. 2. James Denton, D.C.L. Chancellor to the Lady Mary, Dowager of France, Dean of Lichfield, and Lord President of Wales. 3. William Conisby became a Student of the common law, and a learned Judge. 4. Edward Hall, afterward a Judge, and a useful historian. 5. Walter Haddon, Master of the Requests to queen Elizabeth. 6. Ralph Colfield, Clerk of the Council in Wales to king Edward VI. He discovered the cheating of dicers. 7. Thomas Wilson, principal Secretary to queen Elizabeth. 8. Giles Fletcher, Ambassador for queen Elizabeth into Russia, Commissioner into Scotland, Germany, and the Low Countries. 9. Thomas Ridley, Doctor of Law, Master of the Chancery, knight, and Vicar-general. 10. John Osborne, Remembrancer to the Treasurer. He never took fee of any clergyman. 11. Joseph Jesop, Secretary to Secretary Walsingham. 12. Sir Albert Morton, principal Secretary to king James. All the former were of the foundation. 13. Sir Francis Walsingham, principal Secretary of State, was Fellow-Commoner of this House, to which he gave the king of Spain's Bible.

LEARNED WRITERS.—1, 2. Whereas Thomas Stacie and William Sutton, (master, and his scholar, both excellent astrologers,) are by Pitzæus † assigned to flourish in this College some years before the same was founded, his prolepsis is thus to be understood,—that they studied in those old Hostels out of which King's College was afterwards erected. 3. Richard Crooke, Orator and Greek Professor. 4. Osmund Lake, a profound scholar. 5. John Cowell, Doctor of Civil Law, eminent to all posterity for his “Interpreter” and “Institutions.” 6. Thomas Thomas, known

\* In *Le Neve* his name is John.—EDIT.

† *Viz.* *anno* 1440.



by the "Dictionary" of his setting forth. 7. Sir William Temple, Provost of Trinity College in Dublin, wrote a "Comment on Ramus." 8. Anthony Wotton, first Professor of Divinity in Gresham College. 9. Samuel Hieron, a powerful preacher in his printed works. 10. William Sclater, D.D. a most judicious divine. 11. Elnathan Par, an industrious writer. 12. Edward Kellet, D.D. a profound scholar. 13. Dr. Thomas Goad, of whom largely hereafter. 14. Richard Mountague, a great antiquary, bishop of Norwich. 15. Dr. William Gouge, late of Blackfriars.

**MARTYRS AND CONFESSORS.**—1. John Frith,\* first a Student in this College, (but not of the foundation,) burnt for the testimony of the truth, *anno* 1533. 2. Laurence Saunders suffered for the same, *anno* 1555. 3. Robert Glover, burnt at Coventry for religion. 4. John Hullier, martyred on Jesus-Green in Cambridge. 5. Robert Columbel: he went away Fellow, not daring to stay, because Mr. Stokis (the beadle) had espied a Latin Testament in his hand. 6. Thomas Whitehead, Scholar, and afterward pantler of the College. When Luther's books were sought to be burnt, he kept them close for better times.

**BENEFICES IN THE COLLEGE GIFT.**—1. Fordingbridge vicarage in the diocess of Winchester, valued at £30. 2s. 2d. in the king's book. 2. Stour rectory, in the diocess of Bristol, valued at £16. 4s. 9d. 3. Kingston rectory, in the diocess of Ely, valued at £11. 14s. 3½d. 4. Ringwood vicarage, in the diocess of Winchester, valued at £75. 5s. 5d. 5. Toft Monachorum rectory, in the diocess of Norwich, valued at £8. 6. Leisingham vicarage, in the diocess of Norwich, valued at £6. 7. Harsted rectory, in the diocess of Norwich, valued at £6. 10s. 8. West Rudham vicarage, in the diocess of Norwich, valued at £7. 6s. 8d. 9. Prestcott vicarage, in the diocess of Chester, valued at £24. 9s. 10. Wotton Wawen vicarage, in the diocess of Coventry and Lichfield, valued at £11. 9s. 7d. 11. Dowton [Dunton] Wallat rectory, in the diocess of London, valued at £16.

Behold here the fruitfulness of one vineyard, a single College! and yet we have only gathered the top grapes, such as were ripest in parts, and highest in preferment. How many more grew on the under-boughs, which were serviceable in church and state! Not to speak of many eminent persons still surviving, amongst whom Mr. William Oughtred, beneficed at Albury in Surrey, prince of the mathematicians in our age; whose modesty will be better pleased with my praying for them than praising of them.

\* CAIUS et BALÆUS, *Centuria* 8, page 655.

16—18. *Why so few have been Benefactors to this House. The instrumental Advancers of so worthy a Work. Dr. Sommerset said to be ungratefully used by Cambridge.*

Wonder not, reader, that benefactors are so few, and benefaction so small, to this royal foundation; caused, partly, from the completeness thereof at its first erection; partly, from men's modesty, that their meanness might not mingle itself with princely magnificence. Solomon saith, "What can the man do that cometh after the king?" Eccles. ii. 12. It is petty presumption to make addition to kings' works, and to hold benefaction in coparcenary with them.

We read in John Rouse, how king Henry V. had a design to build a College in the Castle of Oxford; the intended model whereof, with the endowments to the same, he affirmeth himself to have seen; but, prevented by death, his son Henry performed his father's will, (as to his general end of advancing learning and religion,) though exchanging the place from Oxford to Cambridge. We read also in the Oxford antiquary,\* how Henry Beaufort, that pompous prelate and bishop of Winchester, gave two thousand pounds to Henry VI. for the advancing of this College; and how John Sommerset, Doctor of Physic to king Henry VI. Sophister first in Oxford, but afterwards graduated in Cambridge, and twice Proctor thereof, (though not expressed in our Cambridge-catalogue, so imperfect is it,) was very active with his persuasions to king Henry, and concurred much, instrumentally, to the foundation of this College.

He proceedeth to tell us, how the same Sommerset, when aged, fell into want and disgrace; and, coming to Cambridge for succour and support, found not entertainment proportionable to his deserts. Whereupon he publicly complained thereof, in eighty satirical verses,† thus beginning:—

*Quid tibi, Cantabriga, dudum dulcissima, feci ?  
Vultum divertis, Oh ! mihi dura nimis.*

For mine own part, I hate ingratitude, be it in mine own mother; but dare not here condemn her, because ignorant of the cause of Sommerset's poverty. Probably it might relate to the difference of the crown and Lancaster interest; so that, in those dangerous days, Cambridge's charity could not consist with her safety, not daring to relieve him for fear of damnifying herself.

\* BRIAN TWYNE, *Antiq. Acad. Oxon.* page 318.  
and cited by Brian Twyne, page 313.

† Extant in GUIL. WORCESTR.

### 19. *King Edward IV. a Malefactor to this College.*

How ticklish those days were, and with how evil an eye this foundation, from the line of Lancaster, was looked upon by the House of York, is too plain in the practice of king Edward IV. one whose love to learning and religion were much alike; who at once took away from King's College a thousand pounds [of] land a-year, amongst which the fee-farm of the manors of Chesterton and Cambridge. Whereupon no fewer than forty of the Fellows and Scholars, besides Conducts, Clerks, Choristers, and other College-officers, were in one day forced to depart the House, for want of maintenance.\* Indeed I have read, that king Edward afterwards restored five hundred marks of yearly revenue, on condition they should acknowledge him for their founder, and write all their deeds in his name; which, perchance for the present, they were contented to perform. However, his restitution was nothing adequate to the injury offered this foundation, insomuch that Leland complains, *Grantam suam hanc jacturam semper sensuram*, "that his Cambridge will for ever be sensible of this loss."

### 20, 21. *An old Debt well paid. The Arms of King's College.*

One tells us, that,† as King's College was first furnished from Eaton, so Eaton was first planted from Winchester School, whence Henry VI. fetched five Fellows, and thirty-five eminent Scholars, to furnish his first foundation. But let our aunt know, that this debt hath been honestly satisfied, with plentiful consideration for the forbearance thereof. For in the year of our Lord 1524, when Robert Shorton, Master of Pembroke Hall, was employed by cardinal Wolsey to invite Cambridge-men (some full blown in learning, others but in the bud, and dawning of their pregnancy) to plant his foundation at Christ-church, King's College afforded them many eminent scholars, then removed thither: amongst whom were Richard Cox, afterwards schoolmaster to king Edward VI. John Frith, afterward martyred for the truth; John Frier, a famous physician of that age; Henry Sumptner,‡ who, at Christ-church for his religion being hardly used, died soon after; with many more eminent persons, who hereafter, God willing, shall be observed.§ Thus Christ-church in Oxford was first a Cambridge colony. Be this remembered, partly, that Cambridge may continue her original title to such worthy men, and partly, to evidence her return to her sister of

\* CAIUS, *Hist. Acad. Cant.* page 68.  
page 317.  
*infra*, anno 1524.

† BRIAN TWYNE, *Antiq. Acad. Oxon.*  
‡ HATCHER MS. of King's College, anno 1518.

§ *Vide*

what formerly she had borrowed. Otherwise, it matters not on which of the two branches learned men do grow, seeing all spring from one and the same root of the English nation.

I have done with this foundation, when I have told the reader, that king Henry VI. under his Great Seal, by Act of Parliament, confirmed a coat of arms to this College, bearing in chief a flower of France, and a lion of England, that it may appear to be the work of a king. For my instructions herein I must direct my thankfulness partly to the memory of Mr. Thomas Hatcher, who some seventy years since collected an exact catalogue of the Scholars, Fellows, and Provosts of this House; partly to Mr. Thomas Page, of this House, and Vice-Orator of Cambridge, who, as he went over beyond the seas the credit of his College and this University; so, God lending him life, after his accomplishment in his travels, is likely to return one of the honours of our country.

*22, 23. A strange Speech (pretended) of King Henry VI.; considering then Cambridge equal with Oxford in Number of Colleges.*

My pen was now leaving King's College, when it is plucked back again by the feathers thereof casually lighting on the following passage: That when William Wainefleet, bishop of Winchester, (afterwards founder of Magdalen College,\* ) persuaded king Henry VI. to erect some monument for learning in Oxford, the king returned, *Imò potius Cantabrigiæ, ut duas (si fieri possit) in Angliâ Academias habeam.* "Yea, rather," said he, "at Cambridge, that (if it be possible) I may have two Universities in England:" as if Cambridge were not reputed one before the founding of King's College therein.

An improbable passage, which filled me with wonder: for, although none beheld king Henry as a profound person to utter oracles, all acknowledge him of ability to express himself in proportion to truth; who could not be ignorant, that Cambridge had been an University many hundreds of years before these words were pretended to be spoken, and vicing endowed Colleges (unendowed Halls coming not under this consideration) with Oxford itself, as by the ensuing parallel will appear:—

IN CAMBRIDGE.

1. Peter House.
2. Michael House.
3. Clare Hall.

IN OXFORD.

1. University College.
2. Merton College.
3. Balliol College.

\* In Oxford. See "Church History," vol. i. page 515.—EDIT.

## IN CAMBRIDGE.

4. King's Hall.
5. Pembroke Hall.
6. Bene't College.
7. Trinity Hall.
8. Gonville Hall.

## IN OXFORD.

4. Exeter College
5. Oriel College.
6. Queen's College.
7. New College.
8. Lincoln College.

All these Houses were extant in Cambridge before the reign of King Henry VI. equalling those in Oxford for number: All Souls therein not being fully finished; (and King's College being an embryo, whilst All Souls was but an infant;) which plainly proveth Cambridge a most flourishing University before the reign of king Henry VI.

24—26. *The Speech avouched by no Historian. A memorable Tradition, and a necessary Conclusion.*

This made me consider with myself what authentical authors had attested the king's words aforesaid, finding it first printed by Brian Twyne, Oxford Antiquary, and afterwards by Dr. Heylyn, a member of that University; but neither relating to any author by quotation, in their editions which I have seen, which, in a matter of such moment, might justly have been expected. During these my thoughts, the following passages came very seasonably to reconcile what to me seemed a contradiction:—

Mr. Hubbard, my much-esteemed friend, late Fellow of King's College, and Proctor of Cambridge, told me that Mr. Barlow, Fellow of the same House, informed him, how he had heard from Mr. Matthew Bust, the worthy schoolmaster of Eaton, familiarly conversing with sir Henry Savill, Warden thereof, that the said sir Henry Savill, in the presence of sir Isaac Wake, at an Oxford Act, being pleasant at the entertainment of Cambridge-men, in mere merriment, (to try whether he could make cousens\* of his aunt's children therein,) devised the story, far from any love of falsehood, or mischievous intent to deceive posterity, but only for present delight. Which, since, it seems, (how soon are great men's jests made meaner men's earnest!) hath passed for current, some confirming, more crediting, none opposing it; and from GOING, *in talk*, comes now to FLY, *in print*; and, if not timely checked, will

\* I have suffered this word to retain its ancient spelling, because it will more readily suggest to the reader Fuller's pun, as conveyed in the double meaning. As *cozener* is "a deceiver," so *cozens* here is intended both for "persons deceived," and for *cousins*, "an aunt's children."—EDIT.

in the next age acquire to itself a peaceable possession of a general belief.

I confess this is hearsay at the third mouth, losing much of the lustre thereof, because removed three descents from the original. However, I conceive, my private resolutions just and equal, who will condemn it for falsehood in that very minute when the afore-said speech of king Henry VI. shall be avouched out of a warrantable author; till which time, I shall account **THAT** no serious speech of a king, but the knight's jocular expression: I say again, this my *audivi* from my friend shall prevail with me till confuted with the *inspexi* of a credible historian to the contrary.\*

*27—29. The Original of the Schools in Cambridge. The old Schools a mean Structure. The several Founders of the modern Schools.*

Pass we now from King's College, but stay still on King's-College ground, (for such were some part of the Schools,) advanced at several times by sundry benefactors. First, the Schools were kept in private houses, hired, from ten years to ten years, by the University for that purpose; during which term they might be diverted to no other use. Such we conceive the School of Tyrannus, wherein St. Paul kept his disputation; and the house of John Goldcorn (since enclosed in Caius College) served the University a long time in that nature.

Afterwards, the public Schools were built at the cost of the University, in or near the place where now they stand. But, alas! it was a little and low structure, more eminent for the learning within, than the building without; yet every whit as good, as anciently the Artists' Schools of Padua, kept at St. Blass, or as the Schools in Venice, (near the steeple of St. Mark,) where Baptista Egnatius, some hundred years since, professed the liberal arts.

Last of all, the present Quadrant of the Schools was erected of brick and rough stone, in fashion as it standeth at this day.

First. *The west side*,† (opposite to the entrance,) built by the University charges, on ground bought of Bene't College; containing, **BENEATH**, the Philosophy- commonly called the Bachelors'-Schools. **ABOVE**, the Physic- and Law-Schools.

Secondly. *The north side*, (on the right hand,) finished *anno Domini* 1400, by sir William Thorpe, a Lincolnshire knight; containing, **BENEATH**, the Divinity-Schools. **ABOVE**, the Regent- and Non-Regent-Houses, having something of chapel character and

\* This matter is afterwards more fully debated in "the Appeal of Injured Innocence," in paragraph 96.—EDIT.

† CAIUS, Hist. Cant. page 80.

consecration in them, as wherein some University devotions are performed.

Thirdly. *The south side*, (on the left hand,) built by Laurence Booth, bishop of Durham, Chancellor of the University ;\* but on the cost of graduates and others ; containing, **BENEATH**, the Logic- or Sophister-Schools, where (in term-time) daily Disputations, and the Bachelors' Commencement is kept. **ABOVE**, the Greek Schools.

Fourthly. *The east side*, (where one entereth at a beautiful porch,) built *anno* 1475, by Rotherham, archbishop of York ; containing, **BENEATH**, on the right hand, a Vestiary, where the Doctors robe themselves, and have a convenient inspection into the Divinity-Schools : on the left hand, the Consistory, where the Vice-Chancellor keepeth his courts. **ABOVE**, a fair library.

This library formerly was furnished with plenty of choice books, partly at the costs of the aforesaid archbishop Rotherham, partly at the charges of Cuthbert Tonstall, bishop of Durham, bred in our University, and quietly allowed unto us by bishop Godwin ; though some since † (on what unjust pretence I know not) have drawn him unto Balliol College in Oxford. But these books, by the covetousness of some great ones, and carelessness of the library-*losers*, (for library-*keepers* I cannot call them,) are for the most part imbezzled, to the great loss of the University, and learning in general.

### 30. *Cambridge Library augmented with many precious Books.*

At this day the library (or *libraries*, shall I say ?) of three successive archbishops, *painful* Parker, *pious* Grindall, *politic* Bancroft, (on the miscarriage of Chelsea College, to which first they were bequeathed,) are bestowed upon Cambridge ; and are beautifully shelved, (at the costs, as I am informed, of sir John Woollaston, alderman of London,) so that our library will now move the beam, though it cannot weigh it down, to even the scale with Oxford. As for the Schools themselves, though our aunt boasteth that it is not worthy to carry the books after Oxford library for the statefulness of the edifice ; yet sure the difference is more in the case than in the jewels therein contained.

Joannes Langton, Chancellor. He, with the consent of the whole University, appoints prayers and mass for Henry VI. A.D. 1444.

Nicholas de Kenton, Chancellor ; a learned writer, 1445.

Joannes de Langton, Chancellor. He obtains letters patents o. the king, whereby he forgives the University all offences, 1446.

\* *Vide infra*, anno 1456.

† BRIAN TWYNE.



Robertus de Ascoughe, Doctor of Law, Chancellor. He gave to the University a goblet of eight ounces. Gulielmus Bingham, Proctor, 1447.

31—33. *Queen's College founded by Queen Margaret. The Inscription on the first Stone. Queen Elizabeth finished what Queen Margaret began.*

Margaret, daughter to Renier, titled "king of Sicily and Jerusalem," wife to king Henry VI. founded a College in Cambridge, near, if not in, a place formerly called Goose-green, dedicating the same to her name-sake, St. Margaret, and St. Bernard, commonly called Queen's College. Indeed, as the trophy of Miltiades in Athens would not suffer Themistocles to sleep, so this queen, beholding her husband's bounty in building King's College, was restless in herself with holy emulation, until she had produced something of the like nature. A strife wherein wives, without breach of duty, may contend with their husbands,—which should exceed in pious performances.

Sir John Wenlock, knight, laid the first stone of this College in the east end and south side of the chapel, in the name of queen Margaret, April 15th, 1448; who caused this inscription to be engraven thereon: *Erit Dominæ nostræ reginæ Margaretæ Dominus in refugium, et lapis iste in signum*: "The Lord shall be for a refuge to the lady Margaret, and this stone for a sign." Indeed, poor queen, soon after she needed a sanctuary to shelter herself, when beaten in battle, and the aforesaid (since Lord) Wenlock slain at Tewkesbury: when, no doubt, her soul retreated to Divine protection, the only succour left unto her; but this sad accident obstructed the hopeful proceeding in her intended foundation.

The child thus "come to the birth, there was no strength to bring forth," had not the skill of the midwife supplied the want of strength in the mother. I mean, Andrew Ducket, for forty years first Master of this House, formerly a friar, rector of St. Botolph's in Cambridge, Principal of Bernard's Hostel, who gathered much money from well-disposed people, to finish this College, and accounted by some, (though not by his purse,) by his prayers, the founder thereof: a good and discreet man, who, with no sordid but prudential compliance, so poised himself in those dangerous times betwixt the successive kings of Lancaster and York, that he procured the favour of both, and so prevailed with queen Elizabeth, wife to king Edward IV. that she perfected what her professed enemy had begun: a good-natured lady, whose estate (whilst a widow) being sequestered for the delinquency of her husband,

(*things*, though not *words*, then in fashion,) made her more merciful to the miseries of others.

**MASTERS.** — Andrew Ducket. Thomas Wilkinson. John Fisher. Robert Beakinshawe. John Jennings. Thomas Fornam. William Frankland. Simon Heynes. William May. William Glynne. Thomas Peacock. William May. John Stokys. William Chadderton. Humfrey Tyndall. John Davenant. John Mansel. Edward Martin. Herbert Palmer. Thomas Horton.

• **BENEFACTORS.**—Lady Margaret Roos, lady Jane Inglethorpe, and lady Jane Burrough. George duke of Clarence. Cicely duchess of York. Richard duke of Gloucester; lady Anne, his wife. Edward earl of Salisbury. Maud countess of Oxford. Marmaduke Lomley, bishop of Lincoln. Andrew Ducket. Hugh Trotter, D.D. John Drewell. William Weld. Sir Thomas Smith. Henry Willshaw. Dr. Stokys. John Chetham. Henry Hastings, earl of Huntingdon. John Joslin. George Mountain. John Davenant.

**BISHOPS.**—1. John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and Cardinal. 2. William Glynne, bishop of Bangor. 3. William Chadderton, bishop of Lincoln. 4. William Cotton, bishop of Exeter. 5. John Jegon, bishop of Norwich. 6. Richard Milbourne, bishop of Carlisle. 7. George Mountain, bishop of London. 8. Robert Touneson, bishop of Salisbury. 9. John Davenant, bishop of Salisbury. 10. William Roberts, bishop of Bangor. 11. John Towers, bishop of Peterborough,

**LEARNED WRITERS.**—1. John Fisher, bishop of Rochester. 2. Desiderius Erasmus. 3. Henry Bullock, friend to Erasmus, calling him *Bovillum*. 4. Dr. Foreman; (having is as good as making of books;) he concealed and preserved Luther's Works, sought for to be burnt.\* 5. Sir Thomas Smith. 6. Thomas Brightman. 7. John Davenant. 8. Stephen Nettles, in his defence of tithes. 9. John Weever, author of the "Funeral Monuments." 10. Dr. John Preston.

**LIVINGS IN THE COLLEGE GIFT.**—St. Botolph Cantab. vicarage, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £2. 14s. 4d. Eversden Parva rectory, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £5. 2s. 4½d. Hoggington [Oakington] vicarage, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £4. 13s. St. Andrew rectory, [in Sandon, Essex,] in the diocese of Canterbury, [London,] valued at £13. 6s. 8d.

So that at this present therein are maintained one President, nineteen Fellows, three-and-twenty Scholars, eight Bible-Clerks, three Lecturers of Hebrew, Arithmetic, and Geometry, besides Officers and

\* Mr. Fox's "Acts and Monuments."

Servants of the foundation, with other Students ; amounting unto one hundred and ninety.

34—38. *Some Truth in much Talk. Give what is thine own. Two Coats for one Body. A Benefactor-general to Learning. An ingenious and useful Design. A.D. 1448.*

Amongst the later Masters of this College, Dr. Humphrey Tyn-dall, dean of Ely, must not be forgotten ; of whom there passeth an improbable tradition,—that in the reign of queen Elizabeth he was proffered by a Protestant party in Bohemia to be made king thereof ; which he refused, alleging, that he had rather be queen Elizabeth's subject, than a foreign prince. I know full well that crown is elective. I know also that for some hundreds of years it has been fixed to the German empire. However, because no smoke without some fire, or heat at least ; there is something in it, more than appears to every eye. True it is, that he was son to Sir Thomas Tyndall, of Hockwold, in Norfolk ; and how Bohemian blood came into his veins, I know not. Sure I am, he gave the arms of Bohemia ; namely, *Mars*, a lion with a forked tail ; *Luna*, crowned, sol, with a plume of ostrich-feathers for a crest.

The catalogue of benefactors to this College presents only the principal, not all in that kind, who, in the days of Dr. Caius, (writing eight years since,) amounted to more than a hundred forty and seven ; much increased at this day. Indeed, no House, for the quantity, is endowed with better land of manors and farms, and less of impropriations belonging thereunto. As for king Richard III. his benefaction made more noise than brought profit therewith ; who conferred on this College all the large and honourable patrimony of John Vere, the thirteenth earl of Oxford, then maintaining St. Michael's mount, in Cornwall, against him ; which soon after was justly resumed by king Henry VII. and restored to the right owner thereof : the College no whit grieving thereat, as sensible no endowment can be comfortable which consists not with equity and honour.

No College in England hath such exchange of coats of arms as this hath, giving sometimes the arms of Jerusalem, (with many others quartered therewith,) assigned by queen Margaret their first foundress. It giveth also another distinct coat ; namely, a crosier, and pastoral staff *saltire*, piercing through a boar's head in the midst of the shield.\* This I humbly conceive bestowed upon them by Richard III. (when undertaking the patronage of this foundation,) in allusion to the boar, which was his crest ; and wherein those church-implements, disposed in *saltire*, or in form of St.

\* See it in SPEED'S Map of Cambridgehire.

Andrew's Cross, might in their device relate to Andrew Ducket, so much meriting of this foundation. However, at this day the College waves the wearing of this coat, laying it up in her wardrobe, and makes use of the former only.

Sir Thomas Smith, in this catalogue, may be beheld not as a Benefactor to this House alone, but all Colleges of literature in England. If Obadiah be so praised to all posterity for feeding a hundred of God's prophets, "fifty in one cave, and fifty in another, with bread and water," 1 Kings xviii. 4; what reward shall this worthy Knight receive, who for ever feeds all "the sons of the prophets," both in Cambridge and Oxford, (members of any Society,) with rent-corn, which he procured by statute in Parliament; which, in due time, (God willing,) shall fully be related.

The aforesaid Knight recurs again (who cannot too often be mentioned) in the list of learned writers; eminent for two excellent works: the one, "Of the Commonwealth of England;" the other, "Of a more Compendious Way of Printing," as which would defalk a fifth part of the cost in paper and ink, besides as much of the pains in composing, printing, and reading of books only, by discharging many superfluous letters in spelling and accommodating the sounds of long and short vowels (to save terminating *es*, and other needless additions of consonants) with distinct characters. However, this design hath not hitherto met with general entertainment, chiefly on a suspicion that this modern way will render ancient books in a short time unreadable to any, save antiquaries; which whether a just or causeless jealousy, let others determine.

39. *Erasmus a Student in Queen's College.* 16 Edward IV.  
A.D. 1450—1475.

Queen's College accounteth it no small credit thereunto, that Erasmus (who no doubt might have picked and chosen what House he pleased) preferred this for the place of his study, for some years in Cambridge; either invited thither with the fame of the learning and love of his friend, bishop Fisher, then Master thereof; or allured with the situation of this College, so near the river, (as Rotterdam, his native place, to the sea,) with pleasant walks thereabouts. And thus I take my farewell of this foundation, wherein I had my education for the first eight years in that University, desiring God's blessing to be plentifully poured on all the members thereof.

Nicholas Close, Chancellor, A.D. 1450.

William Percy, son to the earl of Northumberland, Chancellor, 1451. Mr. Baker, Proctor, 1452; Mr. Fleming, and Mr. Hampden, Proctors, 1453.

Henceforward we shall present the reader with an exact catalogue of all the Proctors in Cambridge. Indeed, we could have begun our list of them a hundred years before, but then must have left many blanks for some years, so unperfect our intelligence, and so uncertain the records ; (meeting therein many times a single Proctor without his mate ; ) and therefore I conceived time enough, henceforward to date the completed and continued series of those public officers.

Henry Boleyn and John Gunthorpe, Proctors, A.D. 1454.

Henry Boleyn and John Bolton, Proctors, A.D. 1455.

Laurence Booth, Chancellor ; John Hurth and John Bolton, Proctors, 1456. In this year, A.D. 1457, Laurence Booth (afterwards archbishop of York) caused a collection to be made through the whole University. 1. From such who hired Chairs of canon and civil law. 2. From those who broke their words in taking their degrees. 3. From every religious person a proprietary of goods, ten marks.\* 4. From every religious man of the Order of Begging Friars, eight marks. 5. From every rich parson, a third part of his parsonage. 6. From bishops and prelates, what they pleased themselves to give. With these moneys, which may be presumed to amount unto a round sum, he built the south side of the Schools, wherein the Sophisters keep their ordinary disputations.

William Wilfleet, Chancellor ; Robert Steukin and John Yotting, Proctors, A.D. 1458.

Robert Woodlark, Chancellor ; Richard Morgan and Oliver King, Proctors, 1459.

William Skybye and William Skelton, Proctors, 1460.

Richard Scroop, Chancellor ; John Barnaby and William Grayham, Proctors, 1461.

Robert Woodlark, Chancellor ; Thomas Langton and John Gray, Proctors, 1462.

John Booth, Chancellor ; John Lindsey and William Rucshaw, Proctors, 1463.

William Wilfleet, Chancellor ; John Bretton and Giles Dent, Proctors, 1464.

William Wyche and William Langthon, Proctors, 1465.

John Herrison, [Chancellor,] Doctor of Physic,† this year set forth a short Book *de Fundatoribus Universitatis*, deducing the same from king Cantaber, the same which I conceive is called “ the Black-Book ” at this day. A.D. 1465.

William Langthon and Christopher Loftus, Proctors, 1466.

John Day and William Wood, Proctors, 1467.

\* CAIUS, *De Antiquitate Cant. Acad.* page 81.

† *Ibid.* page 44.



# VIEW OF THE CHURCHES AND HALLS.

1847



ST. PETER'S HALL



ST. PETER'S COLLEGE



ST. PETER'S HALL



ST. PETER'S COLLEGE



ST. PETER'S HALL



ST. PETER'S COLLEGE



ST. PETER'S HALL



ST. PETER'S COLLEGE



Edward Story, Chancellor; Thomas Wright and Thomas Laxton, Proctors, 1468.

Thomas Rotherham, Chancellor; Thomas Cosyn and Ambrose Rippington, Proctors, 1469; Thomas Taylour and Thomas Mandsey, Proctors, 1470; John Wells and Edward Hanson, Proctors, 1471; John Argent and John Ocley, Proctors, 1472; Ralph Sanger and Richard Tokerham, Proctors, 1473; John Trotter and Richard Smith, Proctors, 1474; Thomas Bond and John Radford, Proctors, 1475.

#### 40. *The Founding of Catherine Hall.*

Richard Woodlark was born at Wakerley in Northumberland, as an author hath affirmed.\* (But finding no such place in that county, ~~and~~ a Wakerley, nigh Stanford, in Northamptonshire,† blame me not, if willing to restore my native shire to its right, and the honour of his nativity.) This Richard, being the last Foundation-Fellow, and third Provost of King's College, purchased four tenements in Mill-street, (over against the late Carmelites then newly Queen's College,) and founded an Hall thereon for one Master, and three Fellows, dedicating it to St. Katherine, the virgin and martyr, since augmented by the bounty of others.

#### 41. *Properly a pretty Hall.*

This may be termed *aula bella*, (if not *a proper*,) "a pretty Hall," even by the confession of the poet so critical in the word:—

*Sed qui BELLUS homo, Cotta, PUSILLUS homo.‡*

"What thing is in itself but small,  
That, Cotta, we do pretty call.

And the beholding of this House mindeth me of what sir Thomas More§ writeth of a she-favourite of king Edward IV. as to this particular conformity betwixt them, (otherwise, far be it from me to resemble this Virgin Hall to a wanton woman,) namely, that "there was nothing in her body one could have changed, except one would have wished her somewhat higher." Lowness of endowment, and littleness of receipt, is all [that] can be cavilled at in this foundation, otherwise proportionably most complete in chapel, cloisters, library, hall, &c. Indeed, this House was long town-bound, (which hindered the growth thereof,) till Dr. Gostlin, that good physician, cured it of that disease, by giving the Bull inn thereunto; so that, since, it hath flourished with buildings and students, lately more numerous than in greater Colleges.

\* J. SCOT'S "Tables."

† See SPEED'S Maps in the catalogues of both counties.

‡ MARTIALIS, lib. i. epigram 10.

§ In his list of Edward V. folio 62.

**MASTERS.**—1. Robert Roch. 2. John Tarton. 3. John Wardoll. 4. Richard Barleston. 5. Thomas Green. 6. Rainold Bainbrig. 7. Edwin Sandys. 8. Edmund Cosin. 9. John May. 10. Edmund Hound. 11. John Overal. 12. John Hills. 13. Richard Sibs. 14. Ralph Brownrigg. 15. William Spurstow. 16. John Lightfoot.

**BENEFACTORS.**—1. Isabel Canterbury, sister to the founder. 2. William Taylor. 3. Catherine Mils. 4. Robert Simpton. 5. Hugh Pemberton. 6. John Chester. 7. Thomas Green. 8. The lady Elizabeth Barnardiston. 9. John Leach. 10. Richard Neelson. 11. Robert Shorton. 12. Dr. Thimblebie. 13. Dr. Middleton. 14. Hugh Garret. 15. Rosamond Paster. 16. John Colmley. 17. John Duke. 18. John Claypoole. 19. John Gostlin, knight. 20. Thomas Buck, esquire-beadle. 21. Mr. Christopher Shirland. 22. Mrs. Stafford. 23. Mr. Thomas Hobbs. 24. Mr. Peter Pheasant. 25. Lady Cocket. 26. Mrs. Jurdain. 27. Lady Ann Barnardiston. 28. Dr. William Gouge. 29. Mr. Coulson. 30. Mr. Skirne, esq. 31. Mr. Alured. 32. Mr. Cradock. 33. The worthy Company of Mercers of the city of London.

**BISHOPS.**—Edwin Sandys, Master, archbishop of York. John May, Master, bishop of Carlisle. John Overal, Master, bishop of Norwich. Ralph Brownrigg, Master, bishop of Exeter.

**LEARNED WRITERS.**—Edwin Sandys, archbishop of York. Richard Sibs, a most pious and profound divine. Thomas Goodwin, Fellow, an eminent preacher. John Lightfoot, an excellent linguist.

**COLLEGE-LIVINGS.**—Coton rectory, in the diocess of Ely, valued at £6. 12s. 9½d.

So that lately in this were maintained one Master, six Fellows, with all the Students, above an hundred.

Richard Freyer and Robert Woodroof, Proctors, A.D. 1476; Thomas Swayne and Gerard Borell, Proctors, 1477; Gulielmus Stockdale and John Laycroft, Proctors, 1478.

Joannes Boynton, Chancellor; Robert Wellby and Robert Luther, Proctors, 1479; Gulielmus Thompson and Roger Bower, Proctors, 1480; Philip Morgan and Thomas Hole, Proctors, 1481; John Green and James Grave, Proctors, 1482.

Thomas Rotherham, Chancellor; John Smith and Robert Haccumblen, Proctors, 1483; John Butler and Gilbert Geuge, Proctors, 1484.

Thomas Northwood, Chancellor; John Butler and Gilbert Urmsen, Proctors, 1485; Gilbert Fitz-John and Henry Babington, Proctors, 1486; Thomas Waters and Gulielmus Birly, Proctors, 1487.

Richardus Badew, Chancellor; Richard Walle and John Basset, Proctors, 1488; Thomas Medcalfe and Roger Layburne, Proctors, 1489.

Thomas Cosine, Chancellor; Gualterus Bedman and Edmond Davy, Proctors, 1490; Richard Burton and John Wolfe, Proctors, 1491; John Sickling and John Walle, Proctors, 1492; John Lound and Richard Huddleston, Proctors, 1493.

Joannes Blithe, Chancellor; Richard Brampton and John Robinson, Proctors, 1494; John Fisher and Thomas Cooke, Proctors, 1495.

Robertus Fitz-Hugh, Chancellor; Jacob Denton and Thomas Gogney, Proctors, 1496.

42—44. *The Foundation of Jesus College. The Incontinence of Saint Radegund's Nuns. John Major's Testimony hereof.*

This year a new College was made in Cambridge of an old nunnery, founded some three hundred years ago; namely, *anno* 1133, by Malcolm of the Scots' royal race, earl of Cambridge and Huntingdon, and dedicated to St. Radegund. This Radegund, daughter to Bertram, prince of Thuringia, was wife to Lotharius king of France, (son to Clodoveus [Clovis] the great, the first Christian king of that country,) who, sequestering herself from her husband's company, about the year 560, lived and died in a small monastery in Poitou, thereby gaining the reputation of a saint.

But, it seems, the Sisters living in Cambridge-nunnery, consecrated to her honour, fell as far short in chastity as she overdid therein. Indeed, one of them left a good memory, or (at least) hath a good epitaph inscribed on her monument in the chapel:—

*Moribus ornata, jacet hic bona Berta Rosata.*

But the rest were not so sweet and fragrant in their reputes, squandering away the wealth and ornaments of their House; which was no wonder for those to do, who were prodigals of their own persons. Not able, therefore, to go away *from* their shame, they went away *with* their shame; and, quitting their convent, concealed themselves privately in their own country. Tradition saith, that, of the two remaining, one was *with child*, the other *but a child*, so that their land seemed lapsed for want of owners, or rather for the owners' want of honesty.\*

But let us hear what John Major, the blunt Scotch historian, saith hereof,† living in Cambridge some years after, whilst those

\* GODWIN, in his catalogue of bishops of Ely, in the "Life of John Alcock." † *De Gestis Scotorum*, fol. 9.

matters were yet fresh in most men's memories :—*Quoddam mulierum cœnobium in Collegium Jesu converterunt consilio eruditissimi pariter et optimi viri Stubis Doctoris Theologi. Nolebant mulieres illæ includi, sed scholasticorum consortium admiserunt. Unde graves viros scandalizarunt, quocirca eis ejectis, et aliis cœnobiis impositis, earum loco studentes inopes positi sunt, quatenus literis et virtutibus incumberent, et folium darent in tempore suo. Hanc mulierum ejectionem approbo. Si enim pro religione prostibula nutriant, earum loco bonæ ponendæ sunt.*

45, 46. *The Character of Bishop Alcock. Jesus College the Bishop of Ely's House.*

Their viciousness thus generally complained of, their House, with all the land thereof, was with king Henry VII. and pope Julius II. bestowed on John Alcock, bishop of Ely, to convert it into a College, dedicated to Jesus, the Virgin Mary, and St. Radegund. A whole volume may be written of this bishop, born at Beverley in Yorkshire, though his parents lie buried at Kingston-on-Hull, where he built a chantry for them, and a free-school for the benefit of others. John Bale (though very sparing of praising persons of that age) charactereth him, "given from his childhood to learning and religion; so growing from virtue to virtue, that no one in England was more reputed for his holiness." He is reported to have fared very sparingly all his life long, and to have conquered the baits of his wanton flesh by his fasting, studying, watching, and such like Christian discipline.

This good bishop established in the House one Master, six Fellows, and six Scholars, commending them to the perpetual tutelage of the bishops of Ely. Hence it is that when those bishops lodge in this College, (as they did *anno* 1556, 1557,) their register reporteth them lying in "their own House:" and though Peter House, as founded by Balsham bishop of Ely, might claim the same title; yet it seems those bishops have a more particular affection to Jesus College. King James, in his coming from Newmarket hither, commended it for the situation thereof, as most collegiate, retired from the town, and in a meditating posture alone by itself.

MASTERS.—1. William Chubbs. 2. John Eccleston. 3. Thomas Alcock. 4. William Capon. 5. John Royston. 6. Edward Pierpoint. 7. John Fuller. 8. Thomas Redman. 9. Thomas Gascoigne. 10. John Lakin. 11. Thomas Ithell. 12. John Bell. 13. John Duport. 14. Roger Andrews. 15. William Beale. 16. Richard Sterne. 17. John Worthington.

BENEFACTORS.—The lady Willoughby. The lady Bray. James Stanley, bishop of Ely. Thomas Thirlby, bishop of Ely, who gave

the advowsons of six vicarages to this College. John Beauchampe, knight. Sir Robert Read, knight. John Andrews. Dr. Royston. Dr. Fuller. John Batemanson. Thomas Roberts. Roger Thorney. Richard Pigot. Godfrey Fuliam. William Marshall. Jane Woods. Thomas Sutton, esq.

**BISHOPS.**—Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury. John Bale, bishop of Ossory in Ireland. Richard Bancroft, archbishop of Canterbury. John Owen, bishop of St. Asaph.

**LEARNED WRITERS.**—William Chubbs: he wrote a Logic, and a Comment on Scotus. Geoffrey Dounes, Tutor to John Bale. Thomas Cranmer, Martyr. John Bale, Confessor. John Dod, Fellow of this House. Sir William Boswell, Lieger in Holland. Christopher lord Hatton.

**COLLEGE LIVINGS.**—All Saints, Cantab. vicarage, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £5. 6s. 3d. St. Sepulchre,\* Cantab. vicarage, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £6. 11s. Comberton vicarage, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £6. 18s. 10½d. Harlton rectory, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £14. 19s. 5½d. Graveley rectory, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £13. 2s. 6d. Gilden Morden vicarage, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £3. 5s. 6d. St. Clement's Cantab. vicarage, in the diocese of Ely, valued at —.

So that lately (namely, *anno* 1635) the foundation consisted of one Master, sixteen Fellows, twenty-four Scholars, besides Officers and other Students; in all one hundred and ten.

Gulielmus Milner and Gulielmus Tape, Proctors, A.D. 1497.

Richard Wyat and John White, Proctors, 1498.

Richard Hutton and Brian Kiddy, Proctors, 1499.

Henceforward, having gained more certainty from our registers, we will enlarge ourselves to a greater proportion both of the names of University-Officers, and numbers of the annual Commencers, adding also the Mayors of the town, not as a foil to the diamond, but because it may conduce something to the certainty of chronology.

Richard Fox, bishop of Winchester, Chancellor; Henry Babington, Vice-chancellor; John Sickling and Thomas Patison, Proctors; Doctors of Divinity, 6; Doctor of Canon Law, 1; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 10; Bachelors of Laws, 13; Bachelors of Arts, 29; Masters of Arts, 23; Masters of Grammar, 4; Henry Kele, Mayor of the town. A.D. 1500.

John Fisher, Chancellor; John Fisher, Vice-Chancellor; Richard Balderton and Richard Wyat, Proctors; Doctors of Divinity, 7; Doctors of Civil Law, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 14; Masters

\* Fuller here appears to be mistaken, as the vicarage of St. Sepulchre is not in the gift of any of the Colleges.—EDIT.

of Arts, 27; Masters of Grammar, 3; Bachelors of Laws, 18; Bachelors of Arts, 23; John Bell, Mayor of the town. 1501.\*

George Fitzhugh, Chancellor; Humphrey Fitz-William, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Edman, and John Hutchinson, Proctors; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctor of Canon Law, 4; Doctor of Civil Law, 2; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 8; Masters of Arts, 22; Masters of Grammar, 1; Bachelors of Laws, 29; Bachelors of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Arts, 34; Robert Morehouse, Mayor of the town. 1502.

Thomas Routhold, Chancellor; Galfride Knight, Vice-Chancellor; John Jennings and Gulielmus Woodroof, Proctors; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Doctor of Music, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 18; Masters of Arts, 19; Bachelors of Laws, 18; Bachelors of Arts, 26; Robert Morehouse, Mayor of the town. 1503.

John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, Chancellor; John Smith, Vice-Chancellor; Robert Cutler and John Watson, Proctors; Doctors of Divinity, 6; Doctors of Canon Law, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 11; Masters of Arts, 17; Bachelors of Laws, 25; Bachelors of Arts, 24; John Bell, Mayor of the town. 1504.

#### 47. *First Chancellor for Life.*

The University perceived it was troublesome every year to choose a new Chancellor. Wherefore, having now pitched on a person of much merit for the place, (so that they could not change but to loss,) this year they concluded his continuance therein for term of life; which act of the University was, *anno* 1514, more solemnly confirmed. Hereafter it will be superfluous to charge every year with the repeated name of the Chancellor, as always the same, till another, on his death, be elected.

48—51. *Erasmus studieth in Queen's College; was first Greek—then Divinity-Professor. No mercenary Writers in Cambridge. Cambridge within few Years much improved in Learning.*

About this time Erasmus came first to Cambridge, (coming and going for seven years together,) having his abode in Queen's College,† where a study on the top of the south-west tower in the old court still retaineth his name. Here his labour in mounting so many stairs,

\* At this date the accurate Le Neve commences his "Account of Vice-Chancellors and Proctors:" which often varies in its nomenclature from Fuller's List. This is a point on which I do not consider myself qualified to act as arbitrator between them.—*EDIT.*

† *Vide* the date of his first epistle, *libro* viii.

(done, perchance, on purpose to exercise his body, and prevent corpulency,) was recompensed with a pleasant prospect round about him. He often complained of the College-ale, *cervisia hujus loci mihi nullo modo placet*,—as raw, small, and windy; \* whereby it appears, 1. Ale in that age was the constant beverage of all Colleges before the innovation of beer (the child of hops) was brought into England. 2. Queen's College *cervisia* was not *vis Cereris*, but *Ceres vitiata*. In my time, (when I was a member of that House,) scholars continued Erasmus's complaint; whilst the brewers (having, it seems, prescription on their side for long time) little amended it. The best was, Erasmus had his *lagena* or flagon of wine recruited weekly from his friends at London; which he drank sometimes singly by itself, and sometimes encouraged his faint ale with the mixture thereof.

He was public Greek Professor, and first read the Grammar of Chrysoloras to a thin auditory,† whose number increased when he began the Grammar of Theodorus. Then took he (by grace freely granted him) the degree of Bachelor in Divinity;‡ such his commendable modesty, though over-deserving a Doctorship, to desire no more as yet, because the main of his studies were most resident on Humanity. Here he wrote a small tract *de conscribendis epistolis*, set forth by Sibert, printer to the University.§ Some years after he took upon him the Divinity-Professor's place, (understand it the Lady Margaret's,) invited thereunto, not with the salary, so small in itself,|| but with desire and hope to do good in the employment.

If any find him complaining, *Hic (o Academiam!) nullus, &c.* “Here's an University indeed, wherein none can be found who will at any rate be hired to write but indifferently!” ¶ I know, this might tend much to his trouble, but sounds nothing to the disgrace of Cambridge. Indeed, in Dutch Academies, many poor people made a mean livelihood by writing for others, though but liberal mechanics in their employment. No such mercenary hands in Cambridge, where every one wrote for himself; and, if at any time for others, he did it *gratis*, as a courtesy for good-will, no service for reward.

How much Cambridge was lately improved in learning, the same author doth thus acquaint us. “Almost thirty years ago,” saith he, “nothing else was handled or read in the Schools of Cambridge, besides Alexander, *the Little Logicals*, (as they call them,) and those old dictates of Aristotle, and questions of Scotus. In

\* *Epistola* 16, libri viii.  
*Acad. lib. ii. page* 127.  
epist. 6.

† Lib. viii. epist. 1.

§ *Idem, ibid.*

|| Lib. viii. epist. 3.

‡ CAIUS, *Hist. Cant.*

¶ Lib. viii.



process of time, there was an accession of good learning, the knowledge of Mathematics came in ; a new and, indeed, a renewed Aristotle came in : so many authors came in, whose very names were anciently unknown. To wit, it hath flourished so much, that it may contend with the prime Schools of this age ; and hath such men therein, to whom if such be compared that were in the age before, they will seem rather shadows of divines than divines." \*

52—54. *Erasmus's Judgment of Cambridge and Oxford. A second, a third, Verdict of the same. His Character of Cambridge Townsmen.*

Take also the comparative character of Cambridge, weighed at this time with Oxford, whilst the judicious hand of Erasmus thus holdeth the beam of the balance : " John, bishop of Rochester,—one [who is] a man, a true bishop, a true divine,—told me some three years since, that in Cambridge, (whereof he is perpetual Chancellor,) instead of sophistical querks, now sober and sound disputations are agitated amongst divines ; whence men depart not only learned but better. Oxford University, by the help of some monks, did at first make some resistance ; but such were curbed with the power of cardinal Wolsey, and the king's authority, who envied so great good to that most famous and ancient School." †

A second of the same kind will not be amiss to present. " England," saith he, " hath two most noble Universities, Cambridge and Oxford ; in both of these the Greek tongue is taught, but in Cambridge quietly, because John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, sits governor of the School, not only for his learning's sake, but for his divine life. But when a certain young man at Oxford not meanly learned did happily enough profess the Greek tongue there, a barbarous fellow in a popular sermon began to rail against the Greek tongue with great and heinous revilings." ‡ And in another place : " By the wisdom of Thomas, cardinal of York, the School of Oxford shall be adorned, not only with all kind of tongues and learning, but also with such manners which become the best studies. For the University of Cambridge long ago doth flourish with all ornaments, John, bishop of Rochester, being the Chancellor thereof." §

But too tart and severe is Erasmus's censure of Cambridge townsmen : *Vulgus Cantabrigiense inhospitales Britannos antecedit, qui cum summâ rusticitate summam malitiam conjunxere.* " Cambridge townsmen go beyond the inhospitable Britons, who have malice joined with their clownishness." || And although some

\* Lib. ii. epistola 10.

† Lib. xvii. epist. 11.

‡ Lib. vi. epist. 2.

§ Lib. vi. epist. 27.

|| Lib. viii. epist. 8, 9.

will say the townsmen are no changelings at this day ; yet, seeing Cambridge is sometimes called *civitas*, and often *urbs* ; some of her inhabitants express much *civility* and *urbanity* in their behaviour.

Richard Burton, Vice-Chancellor ; William Lambert and Edmond Page, Proctors ; Doctors of Divinity, 2 ; Bachelors of Divinity, 7 ; Masters of Arts, 18 ; Bachelors of Laws, 6 ; Bachelors of Arts, 23 ; Henry Kele, Mayor. A.D. 1505.

---

## SECTION VI.

EDVARDO BENLOSSIO ARMIGERO, MECÆNATI SUO  
BENEVOLO.

SEPTEM Principum Aulas transmarinas (ni malè meminì) te perlustrâsse accepi. In quibus splendidæ vestes, dubiæ dapes, ingens famulitium, continuus strepitus, multa denique confusio, quæ in regum hospitiiis, honoris ergô, MAGNIFICENTIA est nominanda.

En tibi plures Musarum Aulas (sic oppositè COLLEGIA dicuntur) in hâc Historiâ nostrâ descriptas ! Esto tu æquissimus arbiter, (cùm utraque tibi notissima,) Aulicorum an Academicorum vita sit beatior. Non dubito te musicolarum placidam quietem, vestitum simplicem, vultum tenuem, fercula vacua, mentes plenas, phaleratis Palatinorum miseriis, ac eorum tolerabili vanitati prælatum.

Præsertim Joannense Collegium dulcedine suâ te allecturum spero ; cùm tibi olim natale solum, ubi literis fuisti innutritus, et cui donaria non contemnenda dedisti, plura et pretiosiora (ni fallor) daturus ; si omnia justæ tuæ expectationi respondissent.

### 1. *King Henry comes to Cambridge.*

Henry VII. came to Cambridge, where he bestowed an hundred marks on the University, and forty pounds (a fair sum in that age from so thrifty a king) on the fabric of St. Mary's, where the scholars meet weekly at public sermons, and yearly at the Commencement.

## 2. *The Building of St. Mary's.*

The mention of St. Mary's mindeth me of church-work indeed, so long it was from the founding to the finishing thereof; as, begun May 16th, 1478, when the first stone thereof was laid in the seventeenth of Edward IV.—The church ended (but without a tower or belfry) 1519, in the eleventh of Henry VIII.—The tower finished 1608, in the sixth of king James.—So that, from the beginning to the ending thereof were no fewer than an hundred and thirty years. There was expended in the structure of the church alone seven hundred ninety-five pounds, two shillings, and a penny, all bestowed by charitable people for that purpose. Amongst whom, Thomas Barow, Doctor of Civil Law, archdeacon of Colchester, formerly Fellow of King's Hall, and Chancellor of his house to king Richard III. gave, for his part, two hundred and forty pounds.\*

## 3—5. *The Foundation of Christ's Collegē. The fair endowments thereof. A Lady of Pity.*

One may probably conjecture, that a main motive which drew king Henry this year to Cambridge was, with his presence to grace his mother's foundation of Christ's College, now newly laid, without Barnwell-gate, over against St. Andrew's church, in a place where God's House formerly stood, founded by king Henry VI. This king had an intention (had not deprivation, a civil death, prevented him) to advance the Scholars of this foundation to the full number of sixty, though (a great fall) never more than four lived there, for lack of maintenancē. Now the lady Margaret, countess of Richmond and Derby, (accounting herself, as of the Lancaster line, heir to all king Henry's godly intentions,) only altered the name from God's House to Christ's College, and made up the number, namely, one Master, twelve Fellows, forty-seven Scholars; in all sixty.

Great and good were the lands which this lady, by her last will, bestowed on this College, in several counties. In Cambridge-shire, the manors of Malton, Meldreth, and Beach, with divers lands and rents, elsewhere in that county. In Leicestershire, the manor of Ditesworth, *aliàs* Diseworth, with lands and tenements in Ditesworth, Kegworth, Hathern, and Wolton. In Norfolk, the abbey of Creyke, which was in the king's hands, as dissolved and extinct, settled by the pope's authority and the king's licence. In Essex, the manor of Roydon. In Wales, Manibire, [Manorbier,] an impropriation.† This lady, being of Welsh affinity, a

\* CAIUS, *Historia Acad. Cantab.* lib. i. page 90.  
scribed out of her last will.

† All these I have tran-

Teuther [Tudor] by marriage, and having long lived in Wales, (where her son king Henry VII. was born in Pembroke,) thought fitting, in commemoration thereof, to leave some Welsh land to this her foundation.

Once the lady Margaret came to Christ's College, to behold it when partly built; and, looking out of a window, saw the dean call a faulty Scholar to correction; to whom she said, *Lentè, lentè!* "Gently, gently," as accounting it better to mitigate his punishment than to procure his pardon: mercy and justice making the best medley to offenders.\*

#### 6. *John Major a Student in Christ's College.*

John Major, a Scottishman, and a Scottish historian of good account, was (only for the term of three months) a Student in this College, as himself acknowledgeth. He reporteth, that the Scholars of Cambridge in his time "usually went armed with bows and swords;"† which our learned antiquary is very loath to believe, except it was John Major's chance to come to Cambridge in that very juncture of time, when the Scholars, in feud with the townsmen, stood on their posture of defence.‡ Thus Pallas herself may sometimes be put to it, to secure her wit by her weapons. But had Major lived as many years as he did but months in this University, he would have given a better account of their peaceable demeanour.

#### 7. *John Leland Fellow therein.*

John Leland, that learned antiquary, was a Fellow of this foundation, as he gratefully professeth. I account it therefore in myself an excusable envy, if repining that the rare manuscripts of his collections were, since his death, bestowed on Oxford library, and not here where he had his education. But I remember a maxim in our Common Law, whercin the lands (such are books to scholars) of a son, deceasing without heirs, fall rather to his uncle or aunt, than father or mother.§

#### 8. *Reformation of Augmentation.*

Many years after the founding of this College, complaint was made to king Edward VI. of superstition therein; the Master and twelve Fellows of this Christ-College superstitiously alluding to Christ and his twelve apostles. Probably the peevish informers would have added, that the *Discipuli*, or Scholars in this House,

\* This I heard in a Clerum, from Dr. Collings.  
cap. 5.

† CAIUS, *His'oria Acad. Cantab.* page 74.

‡ *Lib. De Gestis Scotorum,*

Seberti. fol. 70.

§ *In Vita regis*

were in imitation of Christ's seventy disciples, save the number corresponds not, as being but forty-seven by the original foundation. Hereupon king Edward altered this number of twelve, not by subtraction, (the most easy and profitable way of reformation,) but addition, founding a thirteenth fellowship and three scholarships out of the impropriation of Bourn, which he bestowed on the College: and so real charity discomposed suspected superstition. This good king also gave the College, in lieu of the manor of Roydon, which he took from it, the entire revenues of Bromwell Abbey, such was his bountiful disposition. Nor can it be proved that in his own person he ever did to any an injurious action, though too many under him (if those may be termed "under him" who did what they pleased themselves) were too free of their favours in that nature.

### 9. *The Worthies of this College.*

It may without flattery be said of this House, "Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all;" (Proverbs xxxi. 29;) if we consider the many divines who, in so short a time, have here had their education. Let papists tell you of Richard Reignalds, Doctor of Divinity, a monk of Zion; of William Eximew, a Carthusian; both bred here, and martyred, say they, for the catholic cause, *anno* 1535; of Richard Hall, who ran beyond the seas, became canon of Cambray, and wrote the manuscript-life of bishop Fisher: \* we chiefly take notice of the divines bred here since the Reformation.

MASTERS.—1. John Sickling, Fellow of God's House, first Master. 2. Richard Wiat, Doctor of Divinity. 3. Thomas Thompson, Doctor of Divinity, a good benefactor. 4. John Watsonne, Doctor of Divinity. 5. Henry Lockwood, Doctor of Divinity. 6. Richard Wilks, Doctor of Divinity, chosen, 1549. 7. Cuthbert Scot, Doctor of Divinity, chosen 1553. 8. William Taylor, Doctor of Divinity, chosen 1557. 9. Edward Hawford, Doctor of Divinity, chosen 1559. He was a good benefactor. 10. Edmund Barwell, Doctor of Divinity, chosen 1581. 11. Valentine Carey, Doctor of Divinity, chosen 1610. 12. Thomas Bainbrigg, Doctor of Divinity, chosen 1620. 13. Samuel Bolton. 14. Ralph Cudworth.

BISHOPS.—1. Hugh Latimer, bishop of Worcester, 1535, and martyr. 2. Nicholas Heath,† archbishop of York, 1553. 3. Cuthbert Scot, bishop of Chester, 1556. 4. William Hughes, bishop

\* PITZÆUS, in *crnt. ult.* † So saith Dr. Willet, in his dedication of his *Comment on Samuel*, to this College. Indeed, I find one Heth, (but not his Christian name,) *Fellow of this College*, 1520.

of St. Asaph, 1573. 5. Anthony Watson, bishop of Chichester, 1596. 6. Valentine Carey, Bishop of Exeter, 1620. D. Johnson, archbishop of Dublin. Brute Babington, bishop of Derry, in Ireland. George Downham, bishop of Derry, in Ireland. William Chappel, bishop of Cork, in Ireland.

**BENEFACTORS.**—1. John Fisher, bishop of Rochester. 2. Sir Walter Mildmay, knight. 3. Richard Risley. 4. Dr. Patison. 5. Philip Rawlins. 6. Mr. Jennings. 7. Nicholas Culverwell. 8. Thomas Laughton. 9. Mr. Wentworth. 10. Robert Isham. 11. Richard Bunting. 12. Richard Car.

**LEARNED WRITERS, FELLOWS.**—1. Edward Dearing. 2. John More, preacher in Norwich. He made the excellent map of the Land of Palestine. 3. Hugh Broughton, a learned man, especially in the eastern languages, but very opinionative. 4. Andrew Willet, one of admirable industry. 5. Richard Clarke, one of the translators of the Bible, and an eminent preacher at Canterbury. 6. William Perkins. 7. Thomas Morton, a melancholy man, but excellent commentator on the Corinthians. 8. Francis Dillingham, a great Grecian, and one of the translators of the Bible. 9. Thomas Taylor, a painful Preacher and profitable writer. 10. Paul Baynes; he succeeded Mr. Perkins at St. Andrew's [church]. 11. Daniel Rogers, one of vast parts, lately deceased. 12. William Ames, Professor of Divinity in Holland. 13. Joseph Mede, most learned in mystical Divinity.

**LEARNED WRITERS, NO FELLOWS.**—1. Anthony Gilby. He lived, saith Bale, in Queen Mary's reign, an exile in Geneva. 2. Arthur Hildersham, *Harreticorum malleus*. 3. John Downham, lately deceased, author of the worthy work of "The Holy Warfare." 4. Robert Hill, Doctor of Divinity. He wrote on the Lord's Prayer. 5. Edward Topsell wrote on Ruth. 6. Thomas Draxe. 7. — Elton. 8. Richard Bernard, of Batcomb. 9. Nathanael Shute, another Chrysostom for preaching. 10. William Whately. 11. Henry Scudder.

**LIVINGS.**—Kegworth rectory, in the diocess of Lincoln, valued at £25. 15s. 8d. Toft rectory, in the diocess of Ely, £6. 16s. 9d. Cauldecot rectory, in the diocess of Ely, valued at £3. 12s. Bourn vicarage, in the diocess of Ely, valued at £9. 15s. 9d. *Clipston duarum partium* rectory, in the diocess of Peterborough, valued at £11. 12s. 8d. Helpston vicarage, in the diocess of Peterborough, valued at £8. 0s. 4d. Nawmby [Navenby] rectory, in the diocess of Lincoln, valued at £17. 9s. 10d. Croxton vicarage, in the diocess of Norwich, valued at £6. 13s. 4d. Maverbyre [Maenor Byrr, or Maenorbeer] vicarage, in the diocess of St. David's, valued at £8. Ringstead vicarage, in the diocess of Norwich, valued at —. Gately

vicarage, in the diocess of Norwich, valued at £3. 2s. 8d. Hapton vicarage, in the diocess of Norwich, valued at —.

With many more worthies still alive : amongst whom Mr. Nicholas Estwich, parson of Warkton, in Northamptonshire, a solid divine, and a great advancer of my Church History, by me must not be forgotten. I have done with Christ College, when we have observed it placed in St Andrew's parish, the sole motive, by Major's own confession,\* making him to enter himself therein a student, St. Andrew being reputed the tutelar saint of that nation. Had Emmanuel been extant in that age, he would have been much divided to dispose of himself, finding two so fair foundations in the same parish.

#### 10. *Caution general.*

Be the following caution well observed, which here I place as in the midst of this our History, that it may indifferently be extended to all the Colleges as equally concerned therein : Let none expect from me an exact enumeration of all the worthies in every College, seeing each one affordeth—some writers from me concealed ; let not therefore my want of knowledge be accounted their want of worth—many most able scholars, who never publicly appeared in print ; nor can their less learning be inferred from their more modesty—many pious men, though not so eminently learned, very painful and profitable in God's vineyard. Yea, the general weight of God's work in the church lieth on men of middle and moderate parts. That servant who improved his two talents into four, did more than the other who increased his five into ten. (Matthew xxv. 12.) Tradesmen will tell you, it is harder to double a little than treble a great deal ; seeing great banks easily improve themselves, by those advantages which smaller sums want. And surely many honest (though not so eminent) ministers, who employ all their might in God's service, equal, (if not exceed,) both in his acceptance and the church's profit, the performances of such who far excel them in abilities.

John Eccleston, Vice-Chancellor ; Edmund Natares and Thomas Swayn, Proctors ; Doctors of Divinity, 12 ; Doctors of Canon Law, 2 ; Doctors of Civil Law, 2 ; Doctors of Physic, 2 ; Doctor of Music, 1 ; Masters of Arts, 25 ; Masters of Grammar, 3 ; Bachelors of Laws, 18 ; Bachelors of Arts, 26 ; Bachelors of Divinity, 8 ; John Brakingthorp, Mayor. A.D. 1506.

William Robson, Vice-Chancellor ; John Philips and Richard Picard, Proctors ; Doctor of Divinity, 1 ; Doctor of Canon Law, 1 ; Bachelor of Divinity, 1 ; Masters of Arts, 17 ; Bachelors of

\* *Lib. i. fol. 8. Eo quod ipsum in St. Andrea parochiâ situm offendi.*



Laws, 5; Bachelor of Music, 1; Bachelors of Arts, 42; John Brakingthorp, Mayor. 1507.

William Buckenham, Vice-Chancellor; James Nicolson and Miles Bycardick, Proctors; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Bachelors of Divinity, 5; Masters of Arts, 18; Bachelors of Laws, 12; Bachelors of Arts, 46; Hugh Chapman, Mayor. 1508.

William Buckenham, Vice-Chancellor; William Chapman and William Brighouse, Proctors; Doctors of Divinity, 5; Bachelors of Divinity, 8; Masters of Arts, 14; Bachelors of Laws, 11; Bachelors of Arts, 31; Hugh Raukin, Mayor. 1509.  
1 Henry VIII.

11, 12. *The Death of the Lady Margaret. The Carefulness of her Executors.*

Last year began the foundation of St. John's College, whose foundress, the lady Margaret, countess of Richmond and Derby, died before the finishing thereof. This lady was born at Bletsoe in Bedfordshire, where some of her own needlework is still to be seen, which was constantly called for by king James, when passing thereby in his progress. Her father was John Beaufort, duke of Somerset, and mother Margaret Beauchamp, a great inheritrix.\* So that *fair-fort* and *fair-field* [Beau-fort and Beau-champ] met in this lady, who was *fair-body* and *fair-soul*, being the exactest pattern of the best devotion those days afforded, taxed for no personal faults but the errors of the age she lived in. John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, preached her funeral sermon, wherein he resembled her to Martha in four respects: First, nobility of person: Secondly, discipline of her body: Thirdly, in ordering her soul to God: Fourthly, in hospitality and charity. He concluded, she had thirty kings and queens (let he himself count them) within the four degrees of marriage to her, besides dukes, marquesses, earls, and other princes.† She lieth buried in the chapel at Westminster, near her son, in a fair tomb of touchstone, whereon lieth her image of gilded brass. She died June 29th,‡ and was buried (as appeareth by a note annexed to her testament) the July following.

Her death, though for a time retarding, did not finally obstruct, the ending of St. John's College, which was effectually prosecuted by such as she appointed her executors, namely, 1. Richard Fox, bishop of Winchester. 2. John Fisher, bishop of Rochester. 3. Charles Somerset, lord Herbert, afterwards earl of Worcester. 4. Sir Thomas Lovel, treasurer of the king's house. 5. Sir Henry (afterwards lord) Marney, chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster.

\* CAMDEN, in Bedfordshire.  
John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester."

† RICHARD HALL, in his manuscript "Life of  
‡ STOW's "Chronicle," page 487.

6. Sir John St. John, her chamberlain and near kinsman. 7. Henry Hornby, (master of Peter House,) her chancellor. 8. Sir Hugh Ashton, comptroller of her household. This Sir Hugh (whom I conceive rather Sir *Priest* than Sir *Knight*\*) was a good benefactor to the College, and lieth buried on the north side in the outward chapel thereof, in a tomb with a double portraiture (one presenting him as alive, the other as a skeleton) *be-rebussed*, according to the ingenuity of that age, with an *ash* growing out of a *tun*.

13, 14. *The Site of St. John's College. Crowded with Students.*

The ground whercon this College is sited was long ago consigned to pious uses, though three times the property thereof was altered. 1. When Nigellus or Neal, second bishop of Ely, founded here an hospital for Canons Regular, *anno* 1134. On which king Edward I. bestowed the goods of forestallers or regraters legally forfeited.† 2. When Hugh de Balsham, tenth bishop of Ely, translated it to a priory,‡ and dedicated it to St. John the evangelist. 3. When the lady Margaret's executors, converting it to a College, continued it to the honour of St. John. These, according to her last will, first paid all the debts of the old House, duly proved, (justice must precede charity,) then, with the issues and profits of her land in Somersetshire, Devonshire, and Northamptonshire, erected this new foundation.

So filled, or rather crowded, was this College with Scholars, it was hard for one to get a study several to himself; and, in the days of our fathers, the Students, when writing private letters, were used to cover them with their other hand, to prevent over-inspection. Since, God hath made them *Rehoboth* or "room," by the addition of another court, (not inferior to the former in beauty and bigness,) which made king James once merrily say, that there was "no more difference betwixt Trinity (consisting chiefly in one great quadrangle) and St. John's College, than betwixt a shilling and two sixpences."

15. *A Rape offered on the Muses.*

The infancy of this College met with a malady, which much hindered the growth, almost ended the life, thereof. A generation of prowling, propping, projecting promoters, (such vermin, like Pharaoh's frogs, will sometimes creep even into king's bedchambers, Exodus viii. 3,) questioning the title of the land of the College, took from it at once four hundred pounds of yearly revenue. If the

\* "Such priests as have the addition of SIR before their Christian name were men not graduated in the University, being in orders, but not in degrees." See more on this subject in FULLER'S "Church History," vol. i. pp. 269—271.—EDIT. † CAIUS, *Historia Cantab. Acad.* page 75. ‡ SCOT'S "Tables."

reporter (being a great rhetorician) doth not a little hyperbolize therein, who thus complaineth to the duke of Somerset, lord protector,—*Certi quidem homines, regii ministri, qui divitias regis in acervis pecuniarum ponunt, (cùm benevolentia populi, salus reipublicæ, vera religio, et optima doctrina, optimi regis certissimæ divitiæ extant,) beneficium fundatricis magnam partem nobis abstulerunt: quadringentæ enim minæ annuæ ex nostris prædiolis amputatæ sunt.*—ASCHAM, *Commendatitiarum Epistolarum* lib. i. p. 377. This wrong was done in the beginning of the reign of king Henry VIII. and never after redressed. Strange that the lady Margaret's executors (men too virtuous to offer stolen goods for a sacrifice, and too wise to be cozened with cracked titles) should endow this College with so much land, to which they had no true right; which makes some suspect violence and injustice in the king's officers. Nothing so high, or so holy, but some hungry harpies will prey upon it.

MASTERS.—1. Alan Piercy, son to Henry earl of Northumberland. 2. Robert Shorton. 3. Nicholas Medcalf. 4. George Day. 5. John Tailer. 6. William Bill. 7. Thomas Leaver. 8. Thomas Watson. 9. George Bullock. 10. James Pilkington. 11. Leonard Pilkington. 12. Richard Longworth. 13. Nicholas Sheppard. 14. John Still. 15. Richard Houland. 16. William Whitaker. 17. Richard Clayton. 18. Owen Gwin. 19. William Beal. 20. Dr. John Arrowsmith. 21. Dr. Anthony Tuckney.

BENEFACTORS.—1. John Morton, archbishop of Canterbury. 2. Lady Anne Rooksby. 3. Dr. Fell. 4. Dr. Keyton. 5. Hugh Ashton. 6. Dr. Lupton. 7. Dr. Thimbleby. 8. Dr. Dounham. 9. John Constable. 10. Robert Simpson. 11. Robert Duckett. 12. Thomas Lane. 13. John Grigson. 14. James Berisford. 15. Robert Holytrechelm. 16. John Repingham. 17. Dr. Linacre. 18. John Baylye. 19. Dr. Thompson. 20. Walter Saukings. 21. Catherine duchess of Suffolk. 22. John Thurlston. 23. Stephen Cardinall. 24. Sir Ambrose Caves. 25. Thomas Coney. 26. Dr. Goodman. 27. William Cecil lord Burghley. 28. Lady Mildred Cecil. 29. Sir Henry Billingsley. 30. Dr. Gwin. 31. The lady Jermin. 32. Henry Heblethwaite. 33. William Spalding, and, 34. William Spalding's brother. 35. Robert Booth. 36. Henry Alby. 37. John Walton. 38. John Waller. 39. Mary countess of Shrewsbury. 40. George Palm. 41. William lord Maynard. 42. Robert Lewes. 43. John Knewstubs. 44. Mrs. Cutler. 45. John Hooper. 46. John Williams, lord keeper, who built a most beautiful library. 47. Sir Ralph Hare. 48. Robert Johnson.

BISHOPS.—1. John Taylor, bishop of Lincoln. 2. Ralph Baines, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield. 3. George Day, bishop

of Chichester. 4. Thomas Watson, bishop of Lincoln. 5. James Pilkington, bishop of Durham. 6. Robert Horne, bishop of Winchester. 7. Richard Curteise, bishop of Chichester. 8. Thomas Dames, bishop of St. Asaph. 9. Richard Houland, bishop of Peterborough. 10. John Still, bishop of Bath and Wells. 11. John Coldwell, bishop of Sarum. 12. William Morgan, bishop of St. Asaph. 13. Hugh Billet, bishop of Chester. 14. Richard Vaughan, bishop of London. 15. Richard Neile, archbishop of York. 16. Thomas Morton, bishop of Durham. 17. John Williams, archbishop of York. 18. Richard Senhouse, bishop of Carlisle. 19. David Dalbin, bishop of Bangor.

LEARNED WRITERS.—1. Roger Hutchinson. 2. John Seaton. 3. Ralph Baines, Professor of Hebrew in Paris. 4. George Bullock, the author of BULLOCK'S "Concordance." 5. Roger Ascham. 6. William Cecil, lord treasurer. 7. William Morgan, who first translated the Bible into Welsh. 8. John Knewstubs. 9. William Whitaker. 10. Thomas Morton.

LIVINGS IN THE COLLEGE GIFT.—1. Freshwater rectory, in the diocese of Winchester, valued at £19. 8s. 4d. 2. Ospringe vicarage, in the diocese of Canterbury, valued at £10. 3. Higham vicarage, in the diocese of Canterbury, valued at £8. 10s. 4. Thorington [*cum* Frating] rectory, in the diocese of London, valued at £16. 5. Sunninghill vicarage, in the diocese of Salisbury, valued at ——. 6. Aldworth vicarage, in the diocese of Salisbury. £8. 15s. 8½d.

So that lately, (namely, *anno* 1634,) there were in this College, one Master, fifty-four Fellows, four-score and eight Scholars, beside Officers and Servants of the foundation, with other Students; in all, one hundred and eighty-two.

### 16, 17. *An infant Rebellion, seasonably crushed.*

Great was the opposition against the election of Dr. Whitaker, the sixteenth Master of this House, fetched from Trinity College. He was appointed by the queen's *mandamus*, and Dr. Capcoat, Vice-Chancellor, (and Fellow of Trinity College,) went along with him *magnâ comitante catereâ*, solemnly to induct him to his place, when he met with an unexpected obstruction. *Non datur penetratio corporum*. The gates were shut, and partly *man-ned*, partly *boy-ed*, against him.

The Vice-Chancellor retreated to Trinity College; and, consulting with lawyers what was to be done in the case, according to their advice, created Dr. Whitaker Master of St. John's in his own chamber, by virtue of the queen's mandate. This done, he *re-advanceth* to St. John's, and with (as I may say) a *posse academiae*,

demands admission. The Johnians, having intelligence by their emissaries, that the property of the person was altered, and Dr. Whitaker invested in their Mastership, and knowing the queen would maintain her power from her crown to her foot, took wit in their anger, and peaceably received him. However, great the heart-burnings in this House for many years after; and I will run the hazard of the reader's displeasure in transmitting the following story to posterity.

18—23. *A Rakehell to be chosen before a Dunce. The first [and] second Reasons. An ingenuous Master well met with an ingenuous Fellow. Well spoken, well taken.*

A senior Fellow of St. John's, (of the opposite faction to the Master,) in the presence of Dr. Whitaker, falling on this subject, (proper enough to his text,)—what requisites should qualify a Scholar for a Fellowship, concluded that religion and learning were of the quorum for that purpose. Hence he proceeded to put the case,—if one of these qualities alone did appear, whether a religious dunce were to be chosen before a learned rakehell; and resolved it in favour of the latter.

This he endeavoured to prove with two arguments; whereof this the first: “Because religion may—but learning cannot—be counterfeited. God only can discover the gracious heart, but men may descry an able head. He that chooseth a learned rakehell is sure of something; but whoso electeth a religious dunce may have nothing worthy his choice, seeing the same may prove both dunce and hypocrite.”

His second reason was: “Because there was more probability of a rakehell's improvement unto temperance, than of a dunce's conversion into a learned man, seeing such an one, radicated and habituated, is unchangeable without miracle.”

Common-place ended, Dr. Whitaker desired the company of this Fellow, and in his closet thus accosted him: “Sir, I hope I may say without offence, as once Isaac to Abraham, *Here is wood and a knife, but where is the lamb for the burnt offering?* You have discovered much keenness of language, and fervency of affection; but who is the person you aim at who hath offered abuse to this Society?”

The other answered: “If I may presume to follow your metaphor, know, Sir, (though I am a true admirer of your most eminent worth,) you are the sacrifice I reflected at in my discourse. For, (whilst you follow your studies, and remit matters to be managed by others,) a company is chosen into the College of more zeal than knowledge, whose judgments we certainly know to be bad, though

others charitably believe the goodness of their affections. And hence (of late) a general decay of learning in the College."

The Doctor turned his anger into thankfulness; and expressed the same, both in loving his person, and practising his advice, promising his own presence hereafter in all elections, and that none should be admitted without his own examination; which quickly recovered the credit of this House, replenished with hopeful plants before his death.

#### 24. *Confess, and be forgiven.*

And thus I take my farewell of St. John's College, having first confessed a mistake formerly committed in my "Holy State,"\* in making Dr. Walter Haddon, (Master of the Requests to queen Elizabeth,) a member of this College, being originally of King's College, afterward of Trinity Hall. The error arose, because Roger Ascham,† of this House, commonly calleth him *nostrum Haddonum*; where I mistook their familiarity for membership in the same Society.

Thomas Thompson, Vice-Chancellor; John Samson and John Scot, Proctors; John Bury, Mayor; Doctors of Physic, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 5; Masters of Arts, 29; Master of Grammar, 1; Bachelors of Laws, 16; Bachelors of Arts, 42. A.D. 1509–10.

Seeing the Vice-Chancellors are chosen in November, so that in their office they partake of two years of the Lord, (though otherwise but one annual employment,) I thought fit henceforward to divide them in our chronology into two years.

Thomas Thompson, Vice-Chancellor; George Thompson and Christopher Ducket, Proctors; John Erlich, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 5; ——— Incorp. 1; Doctors of Canon Law, 7; Doctors of Civil Law, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 11; Masters of Arts, 26; Bachelors of Laws, 22; Bachelors of Arts, 44. 1510–11.

John Fawne, Vice-Chancellor; Richard Standbank and William Chaundler, Proctors; John Bell, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 5; Masters of Arts, 21; Bachelors of Laws, 16; Bachelors of Arts, 32. 1511–12.

John Fawne, Vice-Chancellor; Roger Collingwood and Richard Master, Proctors; William Barber, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 5; Masters of Arts, 21; Bachelors of Laws, 7; Bachelors of Arts, 52. 1512–13.

\* In the Life of Dr. Medcalfe.

† In his Epistles.

John Eccleston, Vice-Chancellor; Richard Norris and Thomas Marten, Proctors; Hugh Chapman, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 10; Masters of Arts, 25; Bachelors of Laws, 10; Bachelors of Arts, 24; Bachelor of Grammar, 1. 1513–14.

John Eccleston, Vice-Chancellor; John Cotting and Thomas Goodrick, Proctors; Hugh Chapman, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Doctors of Canon Law, 3; Bachelors of Divinity, 5; Masters of Arts, 14; Bachelors of Laws, 13; Bachelor of Music, 1; Bachelors of Arts, 30; Bachelors of Grammar, 2. 1514–15.

Robert Dussin, Vice-Chancellor; Rowland Bodron and Reinald Bainbrigg, Proctors; Hugh Raukin, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 10; Doctors of Canon Law, 2; Doctors of Civil Law, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 18; Masters of Arts, 42; Masters of Grammar, 3; Bachelors of Laws, —; Bachelors of Music, —; Bachelors of Arts, —. 1515–16.

Edmund Nateres, Vice-Chancellor; John Copinger and Gilbert Latham, Proctors; John Bury, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 5; Doctors of Civil Law, 2; Doctor of Physic, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 13; Masters of Arts, 29; Bachelors of Laws, 14; Bachelors of Arts, 43. 1516–17.

Edmund Nateres, Vice-Chancellor; William Cocks and Roger Ashe, Proctors; William Barber, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Doctors of Canon Law, 2; Doctors of Civil Law, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 4; Masters of Arts, 13; Bachelors of Laws, 11; Bachelors of Arts, 41. 1517–18.

25, 26. *Peter de Valence excommunicated. Many Years after, he confesseth his Fault.*

About this time one Peter de Valence, a Norman, was a Student in Cambridge, when the papist indulgences were solemnly set upon the school-gates, over which he wrote these words: *Beatus vir cujus est nomen Domini spes ejus, et non respexit vanitates, et insanias falsas (istas)*. Inquiry was made about the party, but no discovery could be made. Whereupon bishop Fisher, Chancellor of the University, solemnly proceeded to his excommunication, which he is said to perform with tears and great gravity.

This Peter afterward applied himself to Dr. Goodrich, bishop of Ely, and became his servant; but, as the papists report, could never be quiet in his mind, until, many years after, he had publicly confessed his folly therein, and upon the same place of the school-gates fixed a paper with these words: *Delicta juventutis meæ, et ignorantias ne memineris, Domine*: “Remember not, Lord, my



sins, nor the ignorances of my youth." \* But, may the reader take notice, this story is related by Richard Hall, a zealous papist, in his *Life of bishop Fisher*: a book which, when lately in manuscript, I then more prized for the *rarity*, than since it is now printed I trust for the *verity*, thereof.

John Watson, Vice-Chancellor; William Smith and John Cheswright, Proctors; William Barber, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 10; Doctors of Canon Law, 3; Bachelors of Divinity, 11; Masters of Arts, 26; Bachelors of Laws, 26; Bachelors of Arts, 38. A.D. 1518-19.

### 27. *Monks' turned into Buckingham College.*

Monks' College this year had its name altered and condition improved. Formerly it was a place where many monks lived, on the charge of their respective convents, being very fit for solitary persons by the situation thereof. For it stood on the trans-Cantine side, an anchoret in itself, severed by the river from the rest of the University. Here the monks, some seven years since, had once and again lodged and feasted Edward Stafford, the last duke of Buckingham of that family. Great men best may—good men always will—be grateful guests to such as entertain them. Both qualifications met in this duke; and then no wonder if he largely requited his welcome. He changed the name of the House into Buckingham College, began to build, and purposed to endow the same, no doubt, in some proportion to his own high and rich estate.

Edmund Nateres, Vice-Chancellor; John Denny and William Meddow, Proctors; Richard Clark, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 5; Doctor of Canon Law, 1; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 20; Masters of Arts, 23; Bachelors of Laws, 19; Bachelors of Arts, 31. A.D. 1519-20.

### 28. *A Pair of learned Writers.*

Two eminent men are assigned, by a good author, at this time to flourish in Cambridge: The one William Gonel, a friend to Erasmus, and here public Professor, saith Pits: † but, would he had told us of what faculty! But probably "public Professor," in the lax acceptation of that title, importeth no more than an ordinary Doctor. We need not question his sufficiency, when we find sir Thomas More (an Oxford-man, and able judge of merit) select him for tutor to his children. The other, Stephen Baron, Provincial of the Franciscans, and Confessor, saith one, ‡ to king Henry VIII.

\* See "the *Life of bishop Fisher*," lately printed, page 23.  
*Illustrium Angliæ Scriptorum.*

† *In Appendice*

‡ *Idem*, page 696, in anno 1520.

Some will scarce believe this, only because about this time they find Longland, bishop of Lincoln, performing that place; except king Henry, as he had many faults, had many Confessors at once. But this Baron might have this office some years since. Let me here without offence remember that the senior vicar (as I take it) of the king's chapel, is called "the Confessor of the king's Household," which perchance hath caused some mistakes herein.

Thomas Stackhouse, Vice-Chancellor; Richard Frank and John Crayford, Proctors; Richard Clark, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 9; Doctors of Canon Law, 3; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 5; Masters of Arts, 21; Bachelors of Laws, 7; Bachelors of Arts, 26. A. D. 1520-21.

### 29. *The untimely Death of the Duke of Buckingham.*

Edward Stafford, duke of Buckingham, a gentleman rather vain than wicked, guilty more of indiscretion than disloyalty, by the practice of cardinal Wolsey lost his life, and was beheaded, May 17th. Charles V. emperor, being informed of his death, said that a butcher's dog (such Wolsey's extraction) had killed the fairest Buck in England.\* Let Oxford, then, commend the memory of this cardinal, for founding a fair College therein; Cambridge hath more cause to complain of him, who hindered her of a hopeful foundation. For, this duke, surprised with death, built but little, and endowed nothing considerably in this Buckingham College. No wonder to such who consider, that, prevented with an unexpected end, he finished not his own House, but only "brought the sumptuous and stately foundation thereof above ground at Thornbury in Gloucestershire."† Afterwards, in commiseration of this orphan College, several convents built chambers therein. But, more of it hereafter in Magdalen College.

John Edmunds, Vice-Chancellor; Nicholas Rowley and John Stafford, Proctors; Robert Smith, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 6; Doctor of Canon Law, 1; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 19; Masters of Arts, 22; Bachelors of Laws, 6; Bachelors of Arts, 40. A. D. 1521-22.

### 30. *Crook's Character.*

Richard Crook was the first who now brought Greek into request in the University. He was born in London, bred in King's College, where, *anno* 1506, he was admitted Scholar.‡ Then, travel-

\* GODWIN, in Henry VIII.  
Hatcher.

† CAMDEN'S *Britannia*, ibidem.

‡ MS.

ling beyond the seas, he became public Reader of Greek at Leipsic in Germany. After his return, by the persuasion of bishop Fisher, Chancellor of Cambridge, he professed therein the Greek language. All Students equally contributed to his lectures, whether they heard or heard them not,\* (as in Dutch ordinaries, all guests pay alike for the wine, though they drink it not,†) because they were, or should be, present thereat. Crook dedicated his first public speech, made in praise of the Greek tongue, to Nicholas West, bishop of Ely, because Cambridge (understand him of all the parish-churches therein) is of his jurisdiction :—a passage impertinently pressed by the Oxford antiquary,‡ to prove this University under his episcopal power, as being *in*, not *of*, Ely diocess; exempted from it, though surrounded with it. Crook was also chosen the first public Orator, a place of more honour than profit, whose original salary was but 40*s. per annum.*§

Thomas Green, Vice-Chancellor; Robert Dent and John Briganden, Proctors; George Hoyster, Mayor.|| He was excommunicated for his obstinacy towards the deputy of the Vice-Chancellor. Doctors of Divinity, 5; Doctors of Canon Law, 2; Masters of Arts, 22; Bachelors of Arts, 46. A. D. 1522–23.

### 31. *A Catalogue of Cambridge Orators.*

It will not be amiss here to present the reader with a list of the University-Orators.

ORATORS.—1. Richard Crook, chosen A. D. 1522. 2. George Day, Fellow of King's College, 1528. 3. John Redman, of King's Hall, 1537. 4. Thomas Smith, Fellow of Queen's College, 1538. 5. Roger Ascham, Fellow of St. John's College, 1547. 6. Thomas Gardiner, Fellow of King's College, 1554. 7. John Stokes, of the same, 1557. 8. George Ackworth, 1560. 9. Anthony Girlington, Fellow of Pembroke Hall, 1561. 10. Andrew Oxenbridge, Fellow of Trinity College, 1562. 11. William Masters, Fellow of King's College, 1564. 12. Thomas Bing, Fellow of Peter House, 1564. 13. William Lewin, Fellow of Christ's College, 1570. 14. John Beacon, Fellow of St. John's College, 1571. 15. Richard Bridgewater, Fellow of King's College, 1573. 16. Anthony Wingfield, Fellow of Trinity College, 1580; and re-admitted 1586. 17. Henry Mountlow, Fellow of King's College, 1589. 18. Robert Naunton, Fellow of Trinity College, 1595. 19. Francis Nethersole, Fellow of Trinity Col-

\* *Epistola THOMÆ MORI ad Academiam Oxon.*

*Diversorio.*

page 129.

† BRIAN TWYNE.

|| MS. *Colleg. Corporis-Christi.*

† ERASMI *Colloquia in*

§ CAIUS, *Historia Cantab. Acad.* lib. ii.

lege, 1611. 20. George Herbert, Fellow of Trinity College, 1618. 21. Robert Creighton, Fellow of Trinity College, 1627. 22. Henry Molle, Fellow of King's College. 23. Ralph Witherington, Fellow of Christ's College.

True it is, that before the solemn founding of the Orator's office some were procured on occasion to discharge the same. Thus we find one Caius Auberinus, an Italian, (for that age indifferently learned,) who (some twenty years since) had twenty pence a-piece for every Latin letter which he wrote for the University.\* Henceforth we had one standing Orator, whose place was assigned unto him next unto the Doctors of Physic.

Henry Bullock, Vice-Chancellor; Robert Aldriche and Anthony Maxwell, Proctors; Thomas Brakin, Mayor; Bachelors of Divinity, 12; Masters of Arts, 28; Bachelors of Laws, 9; Bachelors of Arts, 40. 1523-24.

### 32. *Bilney's Scruple in Conscience.*

Thomas Bilney, Fellow of Trinity Hall, zealously advanced true religion.† To the study of Canon and Civil Law, wherein he was graduated, he added a third, (worth both the former,) his study in God's Law and the Holy Scriptures. Once, travelling in the country, he chanced to come to a poor cure, belonging to Trinity Hall, where the people, unprovided of a preacher, pressed him to give them some instruction. Bilney had ability, but no authority, to teach them, as then prohibited by the church. Yet their want so wrought on his charity, that for the present he gave them a collation. This good man, afterwards a Martyr, (the most tender to sin are the most hardy to suffer,) was much troubled in conscience for his contempt of church-order.‡ How many now-a-days without any regret turn preachers without any commission from the church! It is suspicious, on the like occasion, some would scarce follow Bilney to the stake, who run so far before him into the pulpit.

Edmund Nateres, Vice-Chancellor; Edmund Stretey and Thomas Briggs, Proctors; Richard Woolf, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 7; Doctor of Canon Law, 1; Doctors of Civil Law, 2; Masters of Arts, 25; Bachelors of Laws, 13; Bachelors of Civil Law, 3; Bachelors of Arts, 40. A.D. 1524-25.

### 33. *Two opposite Parties, for and against Superstition.*

Now was there high and stiff banding in the schools and pulpits betwixt the

\* *ms Colleg. Corporis-Christi.*  
page 1013.

† Fox's "Acts and Monuments."

‡ *Idem,*

OPPOSERS OF THE PROTEST-  
ANT RELIGION :AND ADVANCERS OF THE  
SAME.

1. Henry Bullock, (his friend Erasmus calls him *Bovillum*,) of Queen's College.

2. Mr. Hugh Latimer, of Christ's College, the Cross-keeper of the University; which he solemnly brought forth on procession-days. He exhorted the scholars not to believe one word of what Mr. Stafford did read or preach.

3. Edmund Nateres, Vice-Chancellor, Master of Gonville Hall; and, generally, all the Heads of Houses.

1. Dr. Foreman, of Queen's College, who therein concealed and kept Luther's books when sought for to be burnt.

2. Mr. Stafford, Divinity-Reader. Let me conjecture him (for the founder's namesake) of Buckingham College.

3. Doctor Thissel, (as Mr. Fox writes him,) of Pembroke Hall. The same, no doubt, with John Thixtil, chosen Fellow there 1519, whom Caius calls *hominem singularis eruditionis nostrâ memoriâ*, insomuch that his *'Αυτὸς ἔφη* was authentic in the Schools.

Edmund Nateres, Vice-Chancellor; Gulielmus Duplake and Thomas Harwood, Proctors; Thomas Saye, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 2; Masters of Arts, 23; Bachelors of Laws, 3; Bachelors of Civil Law, 3; Bachelors of Arts, 42. A.D. 1525–26.

34—36. *Latimer converted by Bilney. [Cranmer ejected from his Fellowship for being married.] Crook, out-bought, departeth to Oxford.*

Bilney, observing in Latimer misguided zeal, repaired to his chamber, and desired him to hear his Confession. The hearing whereof (improved by God's Spirit) so wrought on Latimer, that, of almost a persecutor, he became a zealous promoter of the truth. Then, going to Mr. Stafford, he solemnly asked him forgiveness for his former fierce and causeless fury against him.\*

Thomas Cranmer was outed of his Fellowship in Jesus College for being married.† His wife was kinswoman to the hostess at the Dolphin, which, causing his frequent repair thither, gave the occasion

\* Fox's "Acts and Monuments," page 1731.

† *Idem*, page 1860.

to that impudent lie of ignorant papists, that he was an ostler. Indeed, with his learned lectures, he rubbed the galled backs, and curried the lazy hides, of many an idle and ignorant friar, being now made Divinity-Reader in Buckingham College. But, soon after, his wife dying within the year, being a widower, he was re-elected into Jesus College. I know the statutes of some Houses run thus, *Nolumus Socios nostros esse maritos, vel maritatos*. It seems this last barbarous word was not, or was not taken notice of, in Jesus-College statutes. Cranmer herein is a precedent by himself, if that may be a precedent which hath none to follow it.

John Edmunds, Vice-Chancellor; Nin. Shafto and Jacobus Hulton, Proctors; Henry Gilson, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 5; Doctors of Canon Law, 2; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 5; Masters of Arts, 21; Bachelors of Laws, 14; Bachelors of Arts, 32. A.D. 1526-27.

Richard Crook, University-Orator and Greek-Professor, (invited with more large and liberal conditions,) leaving Cambridge, removed to Oxford. Yet this honourable proviso is entered in our Orators' book, "that, in case Crook should ever be pleased to return, he, for the good service by him performed, should have the precedency of all Cambridge Orators." Great the antipathy betwixt Crook and Leland the antiquary, whose differences began with generous emulation betwixt two eminent competitors of learned honour, but fastened into envy, not to say malicious detraction.

### 37. *The Privilege of the University.*

Dr. Cliffe, Chancellor of Nicholas West, bishop of Ely, humbly submitted himself, and craved pardon for his rashness,\* because he had excommunicated a Bachelor of Arts, contrary to the express privileges of the University. The familiarity betwixt Bilney and Latimer daily increased; their meeting-place, nigh Cambridge, being called "the Heretics' Walk." My inquiry can discover no footsteps thereof, on which side of the town it lay.

John Edmunds, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Smith and John Brewer, Proctors; Edward Slegg, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Doctor of Canon Law, 1; Doctors of Civil Law, 4; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 6; Masters of Arts, 20; Bachelors of Laws, 5; Bachelors of Arts, 26; Bachelors of Grammar, 2. A.D. 1527-28.

### 38. *Latimer's Sermon of Cards.*

Now, many and fierce the conflicts of Friars against Mr. Latimer, especially after he had preached at St. Edward's, (the Sunday

\* MS. *Collegii Corporis-Christi*.

before Christmas,) on the question of the priests to the Baptist, (parcel of the Gospel appointed for the day,) John i. 19, *Tu quis es?* "Who art thou?" It seems, he suited his sermon rather to the time than the text, thereby taking occasion to conform his discourse to the playing at cards, making the Heart triumph,\* and exhorting all to serve God in sincerity and truth, not in the glistening show of men's ceremonies, traditions, pardons, pilgrimages, vows, devotions, &c. Now, show me not the sermon, but show me the souls converted thereby. This blunt preaching was in those dark days admirably effectual, which would justly be ridiculous in our age. I remember in my time a country-minister preached at St. Mary's; his text, Rom. xii. 3, "As God hath DEALT to every man a measure of faith." In a fond imitation of Latimer's card-sermon, he prosecuted the metaphor of *dealing*, that men should *play above-board*, that is, avoid all dissembling, not *pocket cards*, but improve their gifts and graces, *follow suit*, wear the surplice, and conform in ceremonies, &c. All produced nothing but laughter in the audience. Thus the same actions are, by several persons and times, made not the same actions, yea, differenced from commendable discretion to ridiculous absurdity. And thus he will make but bad music, who hath the instrument and fiddlestick, but none of the rosin, of Mr. Latimer.

William Buckmaster, Vice-Chancellor; Rowland Swinborn and John Blith, Proctors; Thomas Brakin, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctors of Canon Law, 3; Bachelor of Divinity, 1; Masters of Arts, 13; Bachelors of Laws, 11; Bachelors of Arts, 40. A. D. 1528-29.

### 39. *A suspected (if not a false) Report.*

I cannot believe, (except on better evidence than the bare testimony of one an engaged person,†) what I find reported, that about this time certain Cambridge-men went to Oxford, being *Græcitatis hostes*, "heartly haters of the Greek tongue." They called themselves by the names of doughty Trojans, Priam and Hector, condemning all other for arrogant and perfidious Greeks.

40—42. [*Cranmer retires to Waltham on account of the Plague. Of which Mr. Stafford dies.*] *Mr. Stafford possibly Margaret Professor.*

Thomas Cramner, now Doctor in Divinity, was grown into so great an esteem for his learning, that he was made by the University one of the examiners of their sufficiency who commenced therein,

\* See it at large in Mr. Fox.  
page 364.

† BRIAN TWYNE, *Antiq. Acad. Oxon.*



until a grievous plague, this year happening in the University, left the Colleges almost empty, and forced him to remove with his prime pupils to Waltham. And here we surrender him up to our former "Church History," where we from this time forward have given a large account of his conversation.\*

John Watson, Vice-Chancellor; John Linsey and Thomas Wilson, Proctors; William Synderton, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 5; Doctors of Civil Law, 2; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Masters of Arts, 8; Bachelors of Laws, 15; Bachelors of Arts, 37. A.D. 1529–30.

Last year's sickness still continued in Cambridge; amongst many that died thereof, Mr. Stafford, Divinity-Reader, ended his life, and that on this occasion: The plague being sore in the town, amongst others, a certain priest, called sir Henry Conjurer, lay sore sick of the said plague. Mr. Stafford, hearing thereof, and seeing the horrible danger that his soul was in, was so moved in conscience to help the dangerous case of the priest, that he, neglecting his own bodily death, to recover the other from eternal damnation, came unto him, exhorted and so laboured him, that he would not leave him before he had converted him, and saw his conjuring books burned before his face; which being done, Mr. Stafford went home, and immediately sickened, and shortly after most Christianly deceased.† Thus a life is well lost whereby a soul is saved.

I dare not affirm that this Mr. Stafford was Margaret Professor in Cambridge, though something might move me to this conjecture; for at this time there was no other public lecture founded in the University. Nor can a negative argument to the contrary be justly deduced from the omission of his name in the catalogue of her Professors, which all must acknowledge to be very imperfect. Yet more probably he was a volunteer in his lecture, having no salary for the reading thereof, save God's glory, his own credit, and the profit of others. And so we take our leave of him; some months after whose death, at the coming-in of cold weather, the air was cleared, and Cambridge, free from infection, was restored to her former healthfulness.

#### 43. Bennet, a Martyr of Cambridge.

Thomas Bennet was this year martyred in Exeter. At the stake he was urged by two gentlemen of that county, standing by, to say, *Precor Sanctam Mariam, et omnes sanctos Dei, &c.* Probably the pronouncing so much might have prevailed for his pardon: but he refused to save his life on the price of superstition. I insert him

\* See vol. ii. pp. 26–401.—EDIT.  
page 1013.

† Fox's "Acts and Monuments,"

here in our History of the University, (not because, as many more martyrs, he commenced Master of Arts therein, but,) chiefly because he was born in the town of Cambridge.\*

John Watson, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Blyth and Robert Masterman, Proctors; John Chapman, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 4; Doctors of Civil Law, 2; Doctors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 10; Masters of Arts, 17; Bachelors of Laws, 11; Bachelors of Arts, 28. A. D. 1530–31.

Simon Heynes, Vice-Chancellor; William Cake and John Taylor, Proctors; William Gill, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Doctor of Canon Law, 1; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 15; Masters of Arts, 28; Bachelors of Laws, 12; Bachelors of Arts, 43. 1531–32.

44—49. *A doughty Pair of Challengers, well worsted for their Pains. They return with Shame. The Report qualified. A causeless Jeer. More Modesty argues not less Learning.*

This year two Oxford-men, the one George Throgmorton, the other John Aswell,† came to Cambridge, having much learning in their heads, (but needing to have brought more in their portman-teaus,) challenging all the University of Cambridge to dispute with them on these questions: 1. *An Jus Civile sit præstantius Medicinâ.* 2. *An mulier morti condemnata et bis suspensa, ruptis laqueis, tertio suspendi debeat.* These two thus ordered themselves,—that Throgmorton should be *the forlorn hope*, and answer first: Aswell was kept for *the reserve*, to come after him.

Five Cambridge-men undertook the disputation; namely, John Redman, Nicholas Ridley, John Rokesby, Elizeus Price, and Griffith Tregarn, (counted in those days the magazine of all the law,) repairing to the Schools, the doors whereof were broken open by crowds of people. These disputants so pressed Throgmorton, that, finding him to fail, they followed their advantage, to improve the foil into a flat fall, and would never suffer him (men's spirits, once cast, are easily kept down) to recover himself. Wherefore, Aswell his partner, who was to answer on the second question, declined it by dissembling himself sick; ‡ who, had he not indeed been sick of a conceited soul, had never come thither on that occasion.

Home go this brace of disputants, wiser than they came to Cambridge, having learned by dear-bought experience, that, if Hercules were so wary as not to fight against two, they two were none of the wisest to fight against so many Herculeases as a University might

\* Fox's "Acts and Monuments," page 1037.  
Warwickshire.

† CAMDEN's *Britannia* in

‡ CAIUS, *De Antiquitate Academiæ Cantab.* pp. 19, 20.

afford. However, the least shadow of shame doth not reflect on Oxford, who was so far from giving them a commission, that she did not know of their coming to Cambridge. Thus, bold children will be venturing into dangers without their parents' leave, though, when it be known, it cost them a good whipping for their pains. Indeed, some have reported,\* that afterwards they were expelled the University for this their daring undertaking. If so, let me say, our aunt Oxford was too severe in her censures; and I pity the two poor men, whose very fault was sufficient punishment.

But an Oxford author† seeks to qualify the matter in his relation. First, he tells us, that Throgmorton was very young, and counted none of the most learned men; both which we can easily believe. For his expulsion after his return, he utterly disavoweth it; and concerning his carriage in Cambridge, he pretends to intelligence, that Throgmorton came off rather as conqueror than conquered. But Caius, present at the disputation, is to be credited before those obscure persons (Bank and Bernard) whose testimony he produceth therein.

As for Ascell, the aforesaid author‡ will not have him come to Cambridge with any intent to dispute, but only as chamber-fellow to accompany Throgmorton; adding withal, "What need had he to dissemble sickness in that place where formerly the pestilence so reigned, (saith Walsingham, in Richard II.) that sound men suddenly died in a frenzy, without either sense or sacrament?" But what is all this to the purpose? What, if there were a pestilential distemper in Cambridge an hundred years before, must the same be supposed still to continue? But we know the gentleman's intent is to give a gird at Cambridge, for the badness of the air thereof. We tell not him of the pestiferous vapour in Oxford, in the reign of queen Elizabeth, wherewith Judge, High Sheriff, Justices, and most of the Grand Jury died all suddenly at the assizes.§ Such casualties happen sometimes in the most refined airs; and, thanks be to God! they are but sometimes.

He proceeds to tell us, that no Cambridge-man ever challenged the University of Oxford to public disputation; as I believe they never did. But I know some who neither can be persuaded nor provoked to fight a duel on any terms; yet the same, in the field, will set their foot as far in the face of their enemy as any alive. When God's glory is concerned, in the cause of the truth, Cambridge, though declining such childish and vainglorious challenges, hath been, is, and, I hope, will be, as forward as any University in the world in the vindicating thereof.

\* *Ut aiunt*, saith CAIUS, *ut prius*.  
page 336.

† *Idem*, page 335.

‡ BRIAN TWYNE, *Antiq. Acad. Oxon.*  
§ CANDEN'S "Elizabeth," in anno 1577.

Simon Heynes, Vice-Chancellor; Nicholas Ridley and Richard Wilkes, Proctors; Robert Chapman, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctors of Civil Law, 2; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 11; Masters of Arts, 26; Bachelors of Laws, 11; Bachelor of Music, 1; Bachelors of Arts, 43. A. D. 1532–33.

John Craiford, Vice-Chancellor; Henry Mallet and John Madew, Proctors; Edward Thompson, Mayor. This Thompson was so obstinate that he was excommunicated by the Vice-Chancellor for his stubbornness.\* Doctors of Divinity, 7; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 10; Masters of Arts, 19; Bachelors of Laws, 17; Bachelors of Arts, 33. 1533–34.

#### 50. [*The University's Renunciation of the Pope's Supremacy.*]

This year the University of Cambridge presented his majesty with the following instrument, wherein they utterly renounced the pope's supremacy:—

*Invictissimo ac potentissimo principi ac domino nostro, HENRICO OCTAVO, Angliæ et Franciæ regi, domino Hiberniæ.*

*Quòd felix et faustum sit et huic florentissimo regno tuo, et universo orbi Christiano, (invictissime princeps ac domine clementissime,) in scripto prodimus, ac palàm dicimus sententiam nostram in quæstione illâ famosâ de Romani pontificis potestate: cujus quæstionis veritatem post maturam et sedulam examinationem, et varias eâ de re, non uno tempore, colloquutiones, diligenti tandem scripturarum collatione et propensione (ut nobis videntur) eruimus, ac erutam ac syngrapho quodam expressam, quod sententiæ nostræ et facti certissimus testis fuerit, majestati tuæ, una cum nostris literis mittimus. Atque hanc sanè provinciam, serenissime rex, abs tuâ sublimitate nobis impositam, libentè suscepimus; partim ob eam (quam majestati tuæ debemus) fidem et obedientiam, quibus ullo tempore aut loco deesse nefas putamus maximum; partim ipsius veritatis amore ac studio, quam dicere et prædicare, quoties e Christi gloriâ, et reipublicæ Christianæ salute atque comodo esse videatur, quum omnium intersit qui Christo nomina dederunt, atque in illius verba jurârunt, tum nostri multo magis referre et interesse videtur, qui quotidie in illius Scripturis versamur, quotidie illius verba et voces legimus, qui est ipsa Via, Veritas, et Vita, quique veritatem custodit in sæculum sæculi. Hujus favorem et gratiam semper tuæ celsitudini adesse precamur, optamusque ut nos et Academiam nostram, quæ tuæ semper volun-*

\* MS. Collegii Corporis Christi.

*tati fuerit obsequentissima, vicissim sublimitatis tuæ favore prosequi, fovere, atque ornare digneris. Christus Servator serenissimam majestatem tuam diutissimè servet :—*

*Universis sanctæ matris ecclesiæ filiis ad quos præsentēs literæ perventuræ sunt, cœtus omnis regentium et non-regentium Academiæ Cantabrigiensi, salutem in omnium Salvatore Jesu Christo. Cum de Romani pontificis potestate, quam ex sacris Scripturis sibi vendicat in omnibus Christianorum provinciis, et in hoc regno Angliæ longo jam temporis tractu exercuit, hisce nunc diebus quæstio exorta sit, ac nostra de eâ re sententia rogaretur, viz. An pontifex Romanus habeat a Deo in Scripturâ sacrâ sibi concessam majorem auctoritatem et potestatem in hoc regno Angliæ, quam quivis alius externus episcopus : nos æquum esse putavimus, ut ad dictæ quæstionis veritatem eruendam omni studio incumberemus, ac nostram eâ de re sententiam et censuram tandem orbi proferremus. Nempè ad hoc potissimùm Academiæ olim a principibus institutas fuisse persuasi, ut et populus Christianus in lege Dei erudiatur, et falsi errores (si qui exorirentur) curâ et solitudine doctorum theologorum penitus convelli ac profligari possint. Quamobrem de prædictâ quæstione deliberaturi more nostro convenientes, ac maturâ consultatione consilia conferentes, quo modo et ordine ad investigationem veritatis certiùs procederetur, atque omnium tandem suffragiis selectis, quibusdam ex doctissimis sacræ theologiæ Professoribus, Baccalaureis, et aliis Magistris ea cura demandata, ut scrutatis diligentissime sacræ Scripturæ locis, illisque collatis referrent ac renunciarent quid ipsi dictæ quæstioni respondendum putarunt. Quoniam auditis, perpensis, ac post publicam super dictâ quæstione disputationem maturâ deliberatione discussis his quæ in quæstione prædictâ, alterutram partem statuere, aut contellere possent, illa nobis probabiliora, validiora, veriora etiam ac certiora esse, ac genuinum ac sincerum Scripturæ sensum referre visa sunt, quæ negant Romano pontifici talem potestatem a Deo in Scripturâ datam esse. Illis igitur persuasi, et in unam opinionem convenientes, ad quæstionem prædictam ita respondendum decrevimus, et in his scriptis nomine totius Universitatis respondemus, ac pro conclusione verissimâ asserimus ; quod Romanus pontifex non habet a Deo concessam sibi majorem auctoritatem aut jurisdictionem in hoc regno Angliæ, quam quivis alius episcopus externus. Atque in fidem et testimonium hujusmodi nostræ responsionis et affirmationis, his literis sigillum nostrum commune curavimus apponi. Dat. Cantabrigiæ ex domo nostrâ regentium secundo die mensis Maii, anno ab orbe per Christum redempto, MDXXXIV.*

Thus was the pope's power fully abrogated out of England. Henceforward "the man of sin," in this land, fell asleep, never

more (we hope) to awake, though once he opened his eyes for a short time in queen Mary's days, and soon shut them again.

51. *The Course of the Scholars' Studies altered for the better.*

Indeed, Sanders himself confesseth, that about this time there were many in Cambridge cordially opposing the popish proceedings; but he telleth us, they were none *ex doctissimis*, "of the most learned therein." But had the meanest of those he decrieth been but of his opinion, how had they started up "most pious and learned" both in an instant! Indeed, *the old learning* began to be left in the University, and a better succeeded in the room thereof. Hitherto Cambridge had given suck but with one breast, teaching Arts only, without Languages. Her scholars' Latin was but bad, though as good as in any other place; Greek, little; Hebrew, none at all: their studies moving in a circle (I mean not, as it ought, in a cyclopædia of sciences, but) of some trite school-questions over and over again. But now the Students began to make sallies into the learned languages, which the industry of the next age did completely conquer. Herein Robert Wakefield, a great restorer of the Hebrew tongue,\* must not be forgot; who, for his better accomplishment, travelled most parts of Christendom, and became Hebrew-Professor, after Reuchlin, or Capnio, in the University of Tubing. But we shall hear more of him, some years hence, after his return.

52, 53. *The Lord Cromwell chosen Chancellor, in the place of Bishop Fisher. The great Good he did the University.*

John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, was beheaded on Tower-hill, June 22nd, continuing Chancellor of the University to his last hour, as chosen into that place during his life, not during his outward happiness. Being long a prisoner, he could not protect the University, as unable to enlarge himself. Yet Cambridge honoured him for what he had done, and continued him in his office. Had this been imitated in after-ages, Cambridge had not been charged with the suspicion of ingratitude, for deserting some of her patrons as soon as greatness deserted them; as choosing, not their persons, but prosperity, for her Chancellor. The lord Cromwell was elected Chancellor in the room of Fisher.

I find not any particular favour conferred, or benefaction bestowed, by him on the University. But this great good he did,—that his greatness kept others from doing Cambridge any harm. Many hungry courtiers had hopes to catch fish, (and fish it would be, whatever came to their nets,) on this turning of the tide,—the

\* BALE, *Descriptio Brit. centuria octava*, page 659.



alteration of religion. How easy was it for covetousness, in those ticklish times, to quarrel the College-lands into superstition? Sacrilege stood ready to knock at their gates; and, alas! it was past their porter's power to forbid it entrance, had not the lord Cromwell vigorously assisted the University on all occasions.

John Craiford, Vice-Chancellor; Richard Ainsworth and Gulielmus Sanders, Proctors; William Hasill, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 9; Masters of Arts, 17; Bachelors of Arts, 30. A.D. 1534–35.

#### 54. *Craiford's Character.*

Hitherto none were chosen Vice-Chancellors of the University, save such who before their election were actual Doctors. Craiford was the first who innovated herein, being Vice-Chancellor before a Doctor, *ut gradus quæstum ex officio faceret*, saith my author; \* not bringing a Doctorship as a qualification to be Vice-Chancellor, but taking it as a gratification conferred on him for being so. Oxford antiquary accounts him one of the ornaments of Cambridge, who at first was bred in Oxford.† We deny not, but that Craiford, very young, might have his education there, but took all his Degrees in Cambridge, though far enough from being any great ornament thereof. For, first, he was expelled out of Queen's College,‡—for no good, we may be sure; yet afterward, by favour of friends, got to be Proctor, *anno* 1522, and, at last, Vice-Chancellor of the University. But he was, saith one,§ *gladiator melior quàm Pro-cancellarius*, “a better fencer than Vice-Chancellor,” who, in a fury, cut off the hand from one Pindar, and cast out a fellow out of the regent-house, catching him up on his shoulders by main force; and I could wish the occasion thereof had been expressed. Surely, he was a man of metal, being Vice-Chancellor two years together, which I may call the critical years of Cambridge, on the alteration of the pope's power therein, (and perchance too much decried by some on the same account,) being chosen of purpose, with his rough spirit, to bustle through much opposition.

#### 55, 56. *The first general Visitation of Cambridge, jure Regio. The Injunctions to the University of Dr. Legh, Chancellor, Cromwell's Surrogate.*

This year Thomas Legh, Doctor of Law, deputy to the lord Cromwell, vicar-general to king Henry VIII. visited the University of Cambridge. We must believe him one of desert, being sole

\* CAIUS, *De Antiquit. Cantab. Academiæ*, lib. i. page 156.  
Oxon. anno 1566, page 27.

† CAIUS, *ut prius*, page 121.

‡ *Assert. Ant.*

§ *Idem, ibidem.*



and single by himself selected for such an employment ; and may be assured that Cromwell never sent a slug on his errands. I find one Dr. Lee petitioned against in the articles and demands of Robert Aske, and his rebellious crew of northern commons, and charged with extortion in visitation of religious houses ; and am confident he was the same person, though some difference betwixt Legh and Lee, in the spelling thereof. For, besides that the vulgar are never critics in writing, no wonder, if they did mis-spell him whom they did mis-call, loading him with opprobrious language. Yet no better evidence of one's honesty than to be railed at by a rabble of rebels. But see this Dr. Legh's injunctions to the University :—

IN DEI NOMINE, AMEN. *Anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo tricesimo quinto, mensis verò Octobris die 22, Nos Thomas Legh, Legum Doctor, præclari ac honorandi viri Magistri Thomæ Cromwell, illustrissimi in Christo principis ac domini Henrici Octavi, Dei gratiâ Angliæ et Franciæ regis, fidei defensoris, domini Hiberniæ, ac in terris supremi ecclesiæ Anglicanæ sub Christo capitis, primarii secretarii, et ad causas ecclesiasticas vicem-gerentis, vicarii generalis et officialis principalis, nec non intra regnum Angliæ, tam in locis exemptis, quàm non exemptis, visitatoris generalis, ad negotium visitationis et inquisitionis Academicæ, sive Universitatis Cantabrigiæ ac Collegiorum, Aularum, ac cæterarum Domuum, sive Hospitiorum Scholarium inhabitantium, habentes in cætera potestatem nobis attributam, injunctiones quæ nobis necessariæ ac opportuniæ viderentur, quascunque indicendi, has injunctiones, sive mandata sacratissimis regiis injunctionibus adjicienda et annectenda fore decrevimus, quæ omnia et singula, non minus quàm illa, sub iisdem pænis a quolibet cujustis Collegii, Aulæ, sive Hospitii hujus Academicæ Præposito, sive Magistro, aliisque Scholaribus, sive Studentibus hujus Universitatis, quibuscunque observari volumus ; et autoritate regiâ nobis in hâc parte commissâ strictè præcipimus atque mandamus.*

*Primum, quòd quilibet Studiosus sive Scholaris intra hanc Academicam Cantabrigiæ observabit omnia et singula statuta, constitutiones, et ordinationes, et laudabiles consuetudines hujus Universitatis, ac Collegii, Aulæ, Hospitii, seu Domûs ubi habitat, juxta primæam foundationem ejusdem, quatenus his admemoratis injunctionibus non requignent, aut studio bonarum et sacrarum literarum, seu hujus regni nostri juribus et statutis non obsunt.*

*Item, quòd nullus Magister, sive Socius alicujus Collegii, Aulæ, sive Hospitii, in superioribus regiis injunctionibus specificati, alicui vendat aut distrahat in posterum, suam Societatem, quoris quæsito aut excogitato colore ; nec aliquam pecuniæ summam pro*

*admissione vel receptione alicujus Scholaris, penitus in futurum capiat.*

*Item, volumus et strictè præcipimus, ut in posterum penitus facessant et cessent factiones inter hujus, vel hujus patriæ, civitatis, aut Collegii concives, sive socios, et quoscunque alios; nec in electionibus Sociorum, Scholarium, Præpositorum, seu aliquo alio communi actu, vel similibus suffragiis edendis, cuicunque ob communem patriam potius assentiant, quàm ei qui literarum studio, vitæ et morum integritate, aliisque corporis et animi dotibus, meritò sit præferendus: cùm quàm turpissimum sit (his præsertim doctis, et bonis opinionibus imbutis, qui virtutis exemplar et speculum esse debent) talibus iniquis et vulgaribus affectibus duci. Quin potius ut hæc Academia omnes ad bonos mores et literarum scientiam, veluti iterùm format et gignit; sic et omnes, quotquot ejus sunt Alumni, se mutuos concives et municipes esse sentiant, singuli singulos pro virili suâ, et cum omni charitate fraternâ, qualitatibus, ac donis externis et internis mutuò auxiliantes, et ad meliora promoverè satagentes.*

*Item, quòd Vice-Cancellarius et Procuratores hujus Universitatis, et quilibet Præpositus, Magister, sive Custos cujuscunque Collegii, sive Hospitii et Aulae hujus Academiae possessiones immobiles, et bona mobilia, in communi habentes exhibeat, et citra festum Purificationis Beatæ Mariæ proximò futurum, chartas, donationes, fundationum, donationum, appropriationum statuta, constitutiones, et Bullas Pontificias, ac alia quæcunque diplomata, et papistica munimenta, hujus Universitatis, ac Collegiorum, Aula-rum et Hospitiorum hujusmodi respectivè, ac etiam rentale mobilium plenum, et fidele inventorium bonorum mobilium eorundem, in manus dicti honorandi viri Magistri Thomæ Cromwell, visitoris-generalis, ejusve legitimi ad hoc deputati, ipsius beneplacitum in eâ parte expectaturi.*

*Præterea, volumus et præcipimus, quòd hæc Universitas unam publicam Lectionem, sive Græcam, sive Hebraicam, ex liberâ optione eorum, qui de gremio ejusdem Universitatis sunt, utram earum maluerint, et conducere arbitrati fuerint, suis impensis continuè sustentet, et suppeditet; quique in illius Lecturæ, quam in aliarum Lecturarum, ubicunque infra hanc Universitatem prælectoribus eligendis, quàm diligentissimè suam operam adhibeant, ut eos ad prælectiones ejusmodi deligant, qui literarum scientiâ, et morum integritate florere noscuntur, et qui purè, sincerè et piè legere volunt, omni affectu carnali, aut quocunque alio respectu iniquo penitus semoto et postposito.*

*Item, volumus et mandamus, quòd omnes et Præpositi, et Magistri, Custodes, Scholares, ac Studentes in hac Universitate, pro*

*animabus fundatoris Universitatis ac Collegiorum, et aliarum in eâdem Domorum quarumcunque, et pro felicissimo statu invictissimi domini nostri regis, et dominæ Annæ ejus legitimæ conjugis, hujus regni reginæ, summique eorum honoris incremento maximo, sub quorum auspiciis vera religio Christiana jam reflorescit, uni Missæ in ecclesiâ Beatæ Mariæ, infra mensem proximo sequentem publicè celebrandæ intersint. Item, quòd quilibet Præpositus, Magister, sive Custos cujusvis Collegii, Aulæ, vel Hospitii memorati habeat exemplar harum et prædictarum injunctionum, ac eas fideliter conscriptas in suâ domo coram omnibus Scholaribus ejusdem semel singulis mensibus legi faciat, et eas a quibusvis volentibus transcribi sinat atque permittat.*

*Item, quòd si aliquis Scholaris et Studens hujus Universitatis, vel etiam ipse Vice-Cancellarius, seu alicujus Collegii, Aulæ, vel Hospitii Præpositus, Magister, sive Custos injunctiones regias, sigillo suo magno sigillatas, vel hac injuntione sibi annexas, seu earum aliquam violaverit; quilibet eorum id quamprimum dictæ regis majestati, aut ejus visitatori generali, seu ejus surrogato denunciari procuret: et si delictum respicit Universitatis Moderatorem aliquem, Vice-Cancellarius et Procuratores denuncianti vel ejus nuncio pecunias necessarias, et alia ad hoc requisita ministrabit. Quod si aliquis alius Præpositus, Magister, sive Custos alicujus Collegii, Aulæ, sive Hospitii, in aliquo præmissorum deliquerit, ipse similiter accusanti et denuncianti viaticum et expensas subministrabit. Reservantes insuper honoratissimo viro Magistro Thomæ Cromwell, et visitatori generali, consimilem potestatem, adjiciendi et diminuendi, quam regia majestas in superioribus injunctionibus ei reservavit.*

*In cujus rei testimonium, quia sigillum de proprio authenticum ad manus non habemus, ideò sigillum officialis domini archidiaconi Eliensis præsentibus apponi mandavimus; et nos officialis antedictus ad speciale mandatum dicti domini commissarii sigillum nostrum præsentibus apposuimus. Dat. xxii. die mensis Octobris, anno Domini 1535, et regni dicti illustrissimi domini nostri regis anno vicesimo septimo.*

#### 56. *King Henry's Injunctions to the University of Cambridge.*

These Injunctions relate as additional to former Injunctions of the kings, too tedious here to exemplify. But take the substance thereof:—

1. He beginneth with bemoaning the barbarism and ignorance which so lately spread in the University, protesting his desire to promote piety, and extirpate heresy, superstition, idolatry, &c.

2. He exhorteth all the members in the University to the embracing of Christ's doctrine in spirit and truth, recommending Mr. Cromwell, their Chancellor, to be their visitor therein.

3. He requires their renouncing all obedience to the pope of Rome ; and that his royal authority be received as supreme, under God.

4. He inciteth them to the study of tongues, because *sensum alienius rei non potest ille assequi, qui rudis est idiomatis quo traditur.*

5. He enjoineth them to found, on the joint cost of all the Colleges, two Lectures, the one of Latin, the other of Greek, to be daily read, (and, by consequence, heard,) on great penalties.

6. That no authors hereafter be publicly read who have written on "the Master of the Sentences ;" but that all Lectures be made on some part of the Scripture.

7. That it should be permitted to all freely to read God's word, in their private studies, and repair to any public place where the same is preached.

8. That hereafter none in the University take any degree in the Canon-Law.

9. He did make void and abolish all ceremonies and observances which any ways did hinder the study of Scholars, or *bonam valetudinem studio amicam.*

10. He ordered, that the youth to be educated in the Arts should read Aristotle, Rodulphus Agricola, Philip Melancthon, Trapezuntius, &c.

11. He forbad the reading of the frivolous Questions and obscure glosses of Scotus, Burleus, Anthony Trombet, Bricot, Bruliferius, &c.

12. He pronounceth all statutes of the University or private Colleges void, if repugnant to the premises.

13. That all Masters of Colleges be bound, by their solemn oath, to the effectual observation of these his injunctions. .

14. Reserving always to the aforesaid Thomas Cromwell, their Chancellor, and his vicar-general, or to his lawful surrogate in that kind, full power to examine, add, and alter any thing according to his discretion, confident of his care herein for the good of the University.

Observe by the way, that at this instant the University of Cambridge was very full of Students, as may appear by that passage in the king's Injunctions : for he reckoneth up the several Colleges, *ubi confluunt, et diversantur, et frequentant Scholares et Studiosi, ex omni diocesi et quâlibet parte hujus regni nostri Angliæ, tam ex Walliâ quam ex Hiberniâ.* So that it seemeth here was then

an universal confluence of Scholars from all parts of the king's dominions.

*57. The Submission of the Master and Fellows of Gonville Hall to the King's Injunctions.*

Three days after Dr. Legh had set forth his Injunctions, the Colleges made their respective submissions thereunto, solemnly subscribing the same. We assure ourselves they used the same form for the essentials ; one copy whereof we have here inserted, that the rest may be measured thereby :—

*Inricitissimo ac pientissimo in Christo principi et domino nostro, Henrico Octavo, Dei gratiâ Angliæ et Franciæ regi, fidei defensori, domino Hiberniæ, ac in terris supremo ecclesiæ Anglicanæ sub Christo capiti.*

*Vestri humiles subditi et devotissimi oratores Willielmus Buckenham, Magister sive Custos Collegii dicti Gonville Hall, Cantabrigiæ, et ejusdem loci Socii, reverentiam et obedientiam, tam excellenti et præpotenti principi debitas et condignas cum omni subjectione et honore.*

*Noverit majestas vestra regia quod nos Magister et Socii predicti, non vi aut metu coacti, dolore aut aliquâ aliâ sinistrâ machinatione, ad hac inducti sive seducti, sed ex nostris certis scientiis, animis deliberatis, merisque et spontaneis voluntatibus ; purè, spontè et absolutè, in verbo sacerdotii, profitemur, spondemus, ac ad sancta Dei Evangelia, per nos corporaliter tacta, juramus vestræ illustrissimæ regis majestati, singulari ac summo domino nostro et patrono, Henrico Octavo, Dei gratiâ, Angliæ et Franciæ regi, fidei defensori, et domino Hiberniæ, ac in terris ecclesiæ Anglicanæ supremo immediatè sub Christo capiti ; quòd posthac nulli externo imperatori, regi, principi, aut prelato, nec Romano pontifici, quem “ papam ” vocant, fidelitatem, aut obedientiam verbo vel scripto, simpliciter vel sub juramento, promitemus aut dabimus vel dari curabimus, sed omni tempore, casu, et conditione, partes vestræ regis majestatis, ac successorum vestrorum sequemur et observabimus, et pro virili defendemus, contra omnem hominem quem vestræ majestati, aut successoribus vestris, adversarium cognoscemus et suspicabimur. Solique vestræ regis majestati, velut supremo nostro principi, et ecclesiæ Anglicanæ capiti, ac successoribus vestris, fidelitatem et obedientiam sincerè et ex animo præstabimus. Papatum Romanum non esse adeò in sacris literis ordinatum profitemur, sed humanitùs traditum, constanter affirmamus, et palam declaramus, ac declarabimus, et ut alii sic publicent, diligenter curabimus. Nec tractatum cum quoquunque mortalium pri-*

*vatim aut publicè inibimus, aut consentiemus, quod pontifex Romanus, aliquam auctoritatem et jurisdictionem, amplius hìc habeat aut exerceat, aut ad ullam posthac restituatur; episcopumque Romanum episcopum modernum, aut ejus in illo episcopatu, successorem quemcunque, non papam, non summum pontificem, non universalem episcopum, nec sanctissimum dominum; sed solum Romanum episcopum, vel pontificem, (ut priscis mos erat,) scienter publicè asseremus: juraque et statuta hujus regni pro extirpatione et sublatione papatùs, et auctoritatis ac jurisdictionis dicti Romani episcopi, quandocunque edita sive sancita, edendaque sive scienda, pro viribus, scientiâ, et ingeniolis nostris ipsi firmiter observabimus, et ab aliis sic observari (quantum in nobis fuerit) curabimus atque efficiemus; nec posthac dictum Romanum episcopum appellabimus, aut appellanti consentiemus; nec in ejus curiâ pro jure aut justitiâ agemus, aut agenti respondebimus, nec ibidem accusatoris vel rei personam sustinebimus; et si quid dictus episcopus per nuncium vel per literas nobis significaverit, qualecunque id fuerit, illud quàm citissimè commodè poterimus, aut vestræ regiæ majestati, aut vestris a secretis consiliariis significabimus, aut significari faciemus: nosque literas, aut nuncium, ad eundem Romanum episcopum, vel ejus curiam, nec mittemus nec mitti faciemus, nisi vestrâ majestate consciâ, et consentiente, aut vestro successore, quod dictæ literæ vel nuncius ad eum deferatur. Bullas, brevìa aut rescripta quæcunque pro nobis vel aliis ab episcopo Romano, vel ejus curiâ non impetrabimus, vel ut talia a quovis impetrentur non consulemus; et si talia pro nobis insciis aut ignorantibus generaliter vel specialiter impetrabuntur, vel aliàs quomodo libet concedentur, eis renunciabimus, et non consentiemus, nec utemur eisdem ullo modo, at eas vestræ majestati aut successoribus vestris tradi curabimus. Exemptioni verò quâ Romano episcopo, vel summo quem vocant pontifici, aut ipsi quocunque nomine appelletur, ejusque Romanæ ecclesiæ, mediatè vel immediatè subjecti sumus et fuimus, ipsiusque concessionibus, privilegiis, largitionibus, et indultis quibuscunque expressè in his scriptis renunciamus, et soli vestræ majestati, vestrisque successoribus, nos subditos et subjectos profitemur, ac nos subjiciemus, et nos solummodò subditos fore spondemus. Nec eidem Romano pontifici, vel ejus nunciis, oratoribus, collectoribus, aut legatis, ullam procuracionem, pensionem, portionem, censum, aut quamcunque aliam pecuniarum summam (quocunque nomine appelletur) per nos aut interpositam personam vel personas solvemus, aut solvi faciemus: statutumque de successione vestrâ regiâ in Parlamento vestro editum, ac omnia ac singula in eodem contenta, juxta formam et effectum ejusdem fideliter observabimus. Præterea in vim pacti profitemur et spondemus, ac in verbo sacerdotali,*



*et sub fidelitate vestrae majestati debitâ et nostrâ coram Deo consci-  
entiâ, promittimus, quod contra hanc nostram prædictam professi-  
onem et sponsionem, nullâ dispensatione, nullâ exceptione, nullâ  
appellatione, aut provocatione, nulloque juris vel facti remedio nos  
tuebimur. Et si quam protestationem, in præjudicium hujus nos-  
træ professionis, et sponsionis fecimus, eam in præsens et in omne  
tempus futurum revocamus, et eidem renunciamus per præsentem  
litteras, quibus propriis manibus nomina nostra subscripsimus, et eas  
nostri communis sigilli apprehensione, et notarii publici infra  
scripti signo et subscriptione committi, curavimus. Dat. et act. in  
Domo nostrâ capitulari, 25 die mensis Octobris, anno ab incarna-  
tione Christi 1535, et regni vestri florentissimi 27<sup>o</sup> præsentibus tunc  
ibid. Johanne Acres, Artium Magister, et Roberto Warmington,  
Baccalaureo in Legibus, testibus ad præmissa accitis et legatis.*

WILLIMUS BUCKENHAM,  
ROGERUS OVERY,  
JOHANNES STYBMIN,

ANDREW DEW,  
LAURENTIUS JOHANNES CAJUS,  
MAPTIT, WILLIMUS BARKER.

*Et ego Johannes Rheseus, notarius publicus dicti illustrissimi  
domini regis regestor principalis, quia professioni, sponsioni,  
juramento, præstationi, ac cæteris præmissis omnibus, dum sic, ut  
præmittitur, sub anno, mense, die et loco prædictis, agerentur, et  
fierent unâ cum prænominatis testibus, personaliter interfui,  
eaque sic fieri et interponi vidi, et audiui, ac mox ut gesta sunt, in  
notam excepi; ideò hoc præsens publicum instrumentum indè con-  
feci, et in hanc publicam et authenticam formam redegi, signoque  
meo tabellionali, ac nomine et cognomine, meis solitis et consuetis  
signari; meque hîc subscripsi, in fidem et testimonium omnium et  
singulorum præmissorum, rogatus legitimè et requisitus.*

Their protestation, taken *in verbo sacerdotii*, relates to the major part, not to all, the Fellows of Gonville, underwriting their names. For I shall not be easily persuaded, that John Cajus, *penultimus subscriptor* in this instrument, being a physician by his profession, was ever in Holy Orders.

#### 58. *University Records delivered to the Lord Cromwell.*

In obedience to Dr. Legh's Injunctions, the whole University, before Candlemas-day next ensuing, surrendered to the king all their charters, donations, statutes, popes' bulls, and papistical muniments, with an exact rental of their lands, and inventory of their goods. The Vice-Chancellor and Senior Proctor went up to



London, and delivered them to secretary Cromwell, Chancellor of the University. And now they are deposited in a safe hand, seeing the same person, as Master of the Rolls, was intrusted with the keeping of the records of the kingdom.

59, 60. *No more Doctors of Canon Law ; which is annexed to Civil.*

Hereafter expect no more Doctors of Canon Law in Cambridge. Formerly, almost every year some were graduated in that Faculty ; and these preceded those of Civil Law, as the pope makes himself to be above the emperor. But now, Gratian fared no better in Cambridge than his brother Peter Lombard. For, as the king had pronounced his sentence of condemnation against the public reading of “the Master of the Sentences ;” so the Decretals were banished after them. King Henry, stung with the dilatory pleas of the Canonists at Rome, in point of his marriage, did in revenge destroy their whole hive throughout his own Universities.

However, afterwards Scholars applied themselves to the reformed Canon Law, namely, so much thereof as afterwards was received, as conformable to the king’s prerogative and the municipal law of the land. These many studied to enable themselves for Chancellors, officials, &c., in several diocesses ; yet so that Canon Law did never after stand by itself, (as subsisting a distinct Faculty wherein any commenced,) but was annexed to Civil Law, and the degree denominated from the latter. And although Civilians kept Canon Law *in commendam*, with their own profession, yet both twisted together are scarce strong enough (especially in our sad days) to draw unto them a liberal livelihood.

---

## SECTION VII.

EDVARDO PALMER DE WALTHAM ARMIGERO.

VIR ATTICISSIME,

FRATRES meos, verbi ministros, sæpiùs audivi sollicitos, ne mentes suæ sensim torpescerent, eò quòd rusticanis viculis damnati, sibi solum sit consortium cum crassis Minervis, quibus inter crudum et coctum nihil interest.

At mea longè dispar conditio, cui, Deo gratias, emunctioris nasi parochiani contigerunt ; e quibus tu,

limato tuo iudicio, me inter prædicandum hebescentem, instar coticulæ, aliquoties exacuisti.

Fateor sanè, præsentiam tuam mihi suggestum ascensuro, non semel metum incussisse, ne forsan, te audiente, aliquid minùs pensiculatum excideret. Sed animum erexit opportuna recordatio comitatus tuæ, quâ lapsibus currentis tam linguæ quam calami facilè veniam es daturus.

Digneris, quæso, lectione tuâ hanc historiolum, vel eo nomine, quod Collegium Trinitatis (unum e tribus conflatum, et Trin-uni Deo dicatum) exhibeat. Collegium amplissimum, non tam rege fundatore, quàm doctissimis suis alumniis superbiens; inter quos, ob summam Græcarum literarum peritiam, te Palmam ferre meritissimè agnoscit.

1—3. *A Combination against Dr. Metcalfe. Great Deserts soon forgotten. Guilt haunted with Justice. A.D. 1534. 27 Henry VIII.*

This year the young fry of Fellows of St. John's in Cambridge combined, yea, conspired, against their old Master, Dr. Metcalfe, a man much meriting of his House; it being hard to say whether St. John's oweth more to the lady Margaret or Dr. Metcalfe; she by her bounty *founded* it, he by his providence kept it from being *confounded*.\* Many a pound he gave, more he got of his friends, for this College. Indeed, he was none of the greatest Rabbins, but he made many good Scholars under him. Thus the dull and blunt whetstone may be said virtually to be "all edge," because setting a sharpness on other instruments. Metcalfe, with Themistocles, could not fiddle, but he knew how to make a little College a great one, by his two-and-twenty years' prudent government thereof.

I find not a particular of the faults which the Fellows laid to Metcalfe's charge. It may be, the greatest matter was, because he was old, they young; he froward, they factious. Indeed, he was over-frozen, in his northern rigour, and could not be thawed to ungive any thing of the rigidness of his discipline. Besides, I suspect him too stubborn in his Romish *mumsimus*, which gave his adversaries advantage against him; who would not be quiet till they had cast him out of his Mastership. Did not all the bricks

\* See more of him in our "History of Cambridge," anno 1508, page 141.

of the College that day double their dye of redness, to blush at the ingratitude of those that lived therein?

Wonder not if Metcalfe survived but few months after his removal. Old trees, if transplanted, are so far from bearing of fruit, that they bear not themselves long, but wither away. However, let not his enemies boast, it being observed, that none thrived ever after who had a hand in Metcalfe's ejection, but lived meanly, and died miserably.\* This makes me confident, that neither Master Cheek nor Master Ascham, then Fellows of the College, had any hand against him; both of them being well known afterwards to come to good grace in the commonwealth.

Francis Mallet, Vice-Chancellor; Henry Joliffe and Robert Stokes, Proctors; Simon Trew, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 7; Bachelors of Divinity, 16; Masters of Arts, 26; Bachelors of Laws, 13; Bachelors of Arts, 18. A.D. 1535-36.

4, 5. *Cambridge Records re-delivered unto them. Query. Whether the Popes' Bulls were in Specie restored.*

Now had the records of Cambridge slept well-nigh a whole year in the custody of the lord Cromwell; not that there was the least intention finally to detain them, but to suspend them for a time, to wean the University from their former fondness to the pope, that for the future they might feed with a better appetite on the king's favours. It was now therefore thought fit to restore them again without the loss of a shoe-latchet to the University. Whereupon Robert Stokes, the junior Proctor, and John Meare, the Esquire-Beadle, went up to London, where the aforesaid records were delivered unto them. After their return to Cambridge, Thomas Argal and Anthony Hussey were deputed by the Regent-house, to receive such records as concerned the University.

Yet I question whether any of the pope's Bulls were restored to the University or no; I mean, those Bulls of a later date, conferred on Cambridge since the massacre-general of their records, in the mad mayoralty of Edward Lyster.† If any such were returned, they might be *monuments*, (looked on for rarities,) but no longer *muniments*, of the University, as too infirm to fence and fortify the same, the pope's power being totally abrogated. However, though not in specie, they were virtually restored; the University exchanging, not losing, her right herein,—only bottoming her privileges, not on papal, but regal, power: *etsi inclytissimus rex ea auferri jusserit, ne pontificum deinceps obtenderetur autoritas, eorum tamen beneficium academice saluum integrumque esse voluit.*‡

\* CAIUS, *Hist. Cant. Acad.* lib. i. page 76.  
 † See our "History of Cambridge," anno 1381, page 83.

‡ CAIUS, *Hist. Cant. Acad.* lib. i. page 105.

George Day, Vice-Chancellor; Richard Standish and Thomas Cobbe, Proctors; Radolph Berkerdike, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 5; Masters of Arts, 19; Bachelors of Laws, 5; Bachelors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Arts, 19. A.D. 1536–37.

William Buckmaster, Vice-Chancellor; Galfridus Gylpin and Henry Sanderson, Proctors; Robert Smith, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctors of Civil Law, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 7; Masters of Arts, 27; Bachelors of Laws, 7; Bachelors of Arts, 35. 1537–38.

William Buckmaster, Vice-Chancellor; Oliver Ainsworth and Alban Longdale, Proctors; Christopher Franck, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 4; Masters of Arts, 20; Bachelors of Laws, 3; Bachelors of Medicine, 3; Bachelors of Arts, 42; Bachelor of Grammar, 1. 1538–39.

*6—8. Gardiner made Chancellor. Contention about pronouncing of Greek. The Champions for the new Mode. An inartificial Argument.*

Stephen Gardiner was chosen Chancellor of the University. He was at the same time Master of Trinity Hall, which he was pleased to hold for many years, together with the bishopric of Winchester.

Francis Mallet and John Edmunds, Vice-Chancellors; Thomas Pulley and Edmund Humphrey, Proctors; John Chapman, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 5; Masters of Arts, 32; Bachelors of Laws, 6; Bachelors of Arts, 30. 1539–40.

Richard Standish, Vice-Chancellor; Henry Bissel and Thomas West, Proctors; William Gil, Mayor; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Doctors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 4; Masters of Arts, 19; Bachelors of Laws, 9; Bachelors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Arts, 49. 1540–41.

A contest began now betwixt the introducers of the new and the defenders of the old pronunciation of Greek. The former endeavoured to give each letter (vowel and diphthong) its full sound; whilst Dr. Caius, and others of the old stamp, cried out against this project and the promoters thereof, taxing it for novelty, and them for want of wit and experience. He affirmed Greek itself to be barbarous, thus clownishly uttered; and that neither France, Germany, nor Italy owned any such pronunciation.

John Cheke, Thomas Smith, (both afterwards knighted, and privy counsellors,) maintained, that this was no innovation, but the *ancient utterance* of the Greeks, which gave every letter its due and

native sound. Otherwise, by the fine speaking of his opposers, vowels were confounded with diphthongs, no difference being made betwixt *λίμος* and *λοιμός*. Nor mattereth it if foreigners dissent, seeing hereby we Englishmen shall understand one another.

Here bishop Gardiner, Chancellor of the University, interposed his power; affirming Cheke's pronunciation (pretending to be ancient) to be antiquated. He imposed a penalty on all such who used this new pronunciation; which, notwithstanding, since hath prevailed, and whereby we Englishmen speak Greek, and are able to understand one another, which nobody else can.

John Edmunds, Vice-Chancellôr; Simon Briggs and Edwin Sandys, Proctors; Robert Chapman, Mayor; Doctors of Laws, 2; Doctors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 9; Masters of Arts, 17; Bachelors of Laws, 5; Bachelors of Arts, 33. A.D. 1541-42.

9. *The Lord Audley builds Maudlin College. The Arms thereof.*

Thomas lord Audley of Walden, Chancellor of England, by license obtained from king Henry VIII. changed Buckingham into Magdalen (vulgarily Maudlin) College, because (as some will have it \*) his surname is therein contained, betwixt the initial and final letter thereof, M AUDLEY N. This may well be indulged to his fancy, whilst more solid considerations moved him to the work itself. As he altered the name, he bettered the condition, of this House, bestowing some lands thereon, and his own coat for the arms thereof, requiring some skill (and more patience) to blazon them; namely, "quarterly, per pale indented or and azure,† on a bend; of the second, a tret *inter* two marteless, or; in the second and third quarter, an eagle displayed of the first."

10-12. *An ill Neighbour to a studious College. A Monarch Master.*

This College alone, cut off from the continent of Cambridge, is on the north-west of the river, having the rose-garden on the one, and (what is no rose) a smoking brewhouse on the other, side thereof, belonging this one hundred and fifty years to Jesus College. It were no harm to wish this House either removed, or otherwise employed on terms mutually beneficial to both Societies.

The Scholars of this College (though farthest from the Schools) were, in my time, observed first there, and to as good purpose as, any. Every year this House produced some eminent scholars, as living cheaper, privater, and freer from town-temptations, by their remote situation.

\* *Skeleton Cant. us.*

† Thus blazoned by Mills.

Whereas the Masters of other Houses are either in the king's-gift or College-choice, this is in the disposal of the right honourable the earl of Suffolk, hereditary patron of this foundation. And whereas much of aristocracy is used in other Colleges, more of monarchy appears in the Master hereof, as absolute in his government, having not only a negative voice, but, in effect, all the affirmative, in making elections.

MASTERS.—1. Robert Evans. 2. Richard Carr. 3. Roger Kelke. 4. Richard Howland. 5. Degory Nicols. 6. Thomas Nevile. 7. Richard Clayton. 8. John Palmer. 9. Barnaby Goche. 10. Henry Smith. 11. Edward Rainbow. 12. John Sadler.

BISHOPS.—1. Richard Howland, bishop of Peterborough. 2. George Lloyd, bishop of Chester. 3. John Bridgman, bishop of Chester.

BENEFACTORS.—1. Henry VIII. 2. Sir Christopher Wray. 3. John Spenliffe. 4. Edmond Grindall, archbishop of Canterbury. 5. Thomas Parkinson. 6. William Roberts. 7. John Hughes. 8. Thomas Sutton. 9. Frances countess of Warwick.\* 10. John Smith, Fellow.

LEARNED WRITERS. ———

COLLEGE-LIVINGS.—Stanton rectory, of Ely diocess, valued £6. 12s. 8d.

So as at this present there is a Master, eleven Fellows, and two-and-twenty Scholars, besides Officers and Servants of the foundation, with other Students; being, in all, one hundred and forty.

13, 14. *A good Proffer. Was it wisely refused?*

Though, at the present, the revenues of this House be not great, some forty years since it was in a fair probability of a large addition of land, had the suit (related at large by the lord Coke, in his Report of Maudlin-College case) gone on their side. At one time, well nigh ten thousand pounds were tendered in composition, (the interest of many being concerned therein,) so suspicious were the defendants of their success.

But Dr. Goche, Master of the College, being a man of a high spirit, well skilled in the laws, and confident of the goodness of his cause, would listen to no composition, but have all or none. He had not learned the maxim, *Dimidium plus toto*, in this sense, “Half with quiet may be more than all with hazard and trouble.”

\* She was daughter to sir Christopher Wray; and (besides one Fellowship and Scholarship she founded) intended three hundred pounds in building to the College, had not one Hammerton, an old servant, (as I am informed,) deceived her.

It was removed from common-law to chancery, where the College was not only cast, but the Doctor, with Mr. Smith, a senior Fellow, lay long in prison, for refusing to obey the lord Egerton's order.

15, 16. *Charitable Mr. Palmer. Learning runs low.*

Amongst the worthies of this House, Mr. Palmer, B.D. late minister of St. Bridget's, (commonly Bride's,) must not be forgotten; a pious man and painful preacher; who (besides many and great benefactions to ministers' widows) hath built and well endowed a neat alms-house at Westminster. Verily I have found more charity in this one sequestered minister, than in many who enjoy other men's sequestrations.

Thomas Smith, Vice-Chancellor; Henry Camberforth and William Wakelyne, Proctors; Thomas Brakin, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 4; Doctor of Laws, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 16; Masters of Arts, 26; Bachelors of Laws, 4; Bachelors of Arts, 29. A.D. 1542-43.

Matthew Parker, Vice-Chancellor; Edward Cosin and Simon Bagot, Proctors; William Hasill, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 13; Masters of Arts, 23; Bachelors of Laws, 2; Bachelors of Arts, 16. 1543-44.

John Madew, Vice-Chancellor; William Barker and Andrew Pern, Proctors; James Fletcher, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 6; Doctor of Laws, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 9; Masters of Arts, 18; Bachelor of Laws, 1; Bachelors of Arts, 35. 1545-46.

There was now a general decay of Students, no College having more Scholars therein than hardly those of the foundation; no volunteers at all, and only persons pressed, in a manner, by their places to reside. Indeed, on the fall of abbeys fell the hearts of all Scholars, fearing the ruin of learning. And these their jealousies they humbly represented in a bemoaning letter to king Henry VIII. He comforted them with his gracious return; and, to confute their suspicion of the decay of Colleges, acquainted them with his resolution to erect a most magnificent one with all speedy conveniency.

17. *Trinity College founded by King Henry VIII.*

Whereupon he seized Michael House into his hands, (whose yearly rents, at old and easy rates, then amounted unto one hundred forty-four pounds, three shillings, and a penny,) and King's Hall, the best landed foundation in the University. Also



he took Fistewick's Hostel,\* (a House unendowed,) and allowed the Gonvillians (still grumbling therat, as not sufficient compensation) three pounds a-year in lieu thereof, till he should give them better satisfaction. Of these three he compounded one fair College, dedicating it to the Holy and Undivided Trinity, and endowing it with plentiful revenues.

### 18. *A dutiful Daughter.*

Queen Mary, calling her chief clergy together, consulted with them about public prayers to be made for the soul of king Henry her father; conceiving his case not so desperate but capable of benefit thereby. They possessed her of the impossibility thereof, and that his Holiness would never consent such honour should be done to one dying so notorious a schismatic. But they advised her, in expression of her private affection to her father's memory, to add to Trinity College, as the best monument he had left; whereon, chiefly at the instance of bishop Christopherson, she bestowed £376. 10s. 3d. of yearly revenue.

### 19. *Magnisecant Newly.*

Dr. Thomas Nevyle, the eighth Master of this College,—answering his anagram most heavenly, and practising his own allusive motto, *Ne vile velis*, being, by the rules of the philosopher, himself to be accounted *μεγάλοποιεπης*, “as of great performances,”—for the general good expended three thousand pounds of his own, in altering and enlarging the old, and adding a new court thereunto; being at this day the stateliest and most uniform College in Christendom, out of which may be carved three Dutch Universities.

MASTERS.—1. John Redman. 2. William Bill. 3. John Christopherson. 4. William Bill, restored by queen Elizabeth. 5. Robert Beaumont. 6. John Whitgift. 7. John Still. 8. Thomas Nevyle. 9. John Richardson. 10. Leonard Maw. 11. Samuel Brooks. 12. Thomas Cumber. 13. Thomas Hill. 14. John Arrowsmith.

BISHOPS.—1. John Christopherson, bishop of Chichester. 2. John Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury. 3. John Still, bishop of Bath and Wells. 4. Gervase Babington, bishop of Worcester. 5. William Redman, bishop of Norwich. 6. Anthony Rud, bishop of St. David's. 7. Godfrey Gosborrough, bishop of Gloucester. 8. Robert Bennett, bishop of Hereford. 9. Martin Fotherby, bishop of Salisbury. 10. Godfrey Goodman, bishop of Gloucester. 11. Leonard Maw, bishop of Bath and Wells.

\* In a preceding page, (42,) Fuller calls this Hostel Phiswick's, and in page 79, Fishwick's. —EDIT.

12. John Bowle, bishop of Rochester. 13. Adam Loftus, archbishop of Dublin. 14. Dr. Hampton, archbishop of Dublin, in Ireland.

**BENEFACTORS.**—1. Thomas Allen, clerk. 2. Sir Edward Stanhope, who gave £900 to the library. 3. The lady Bromley. 4. George Palin, girdler. 5. The lady Anne Weald. 6. Roger Jesson, haberdasher. 7. Mrs. Elizabeth Elwis. 8. Dr. William Bill; 9. Dr. Robert Beaumont; and, 10. Dr. John Whitgift; **Masters of this House.** 11. Dr. Cosins. 12. Dr. Barrow. 13. Dr. Skevington. 14. William Cooper, esq. 15. Peter Shaw. 16. Sir William Sidley, knight and baronet. 17. Sir Thomas Lake, knight. 18. Sir John Suckling, knight. 19. Dr. Robert Bankworth, Fellow. 20. Sir Ralph Hare, knight. 21. Mr. Silvius Elwis, still in the College.

**LIVINGS IN THE COLLEGE GIFT.**—St. Mary's the Great, in Cambridge. St. Michael's, in Cambridge. Chesterton vicarage, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £10. 12s. 3d. Orwell rectory, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £10. 7s. 7½d. Kendal vicarage, in the diocese of Carlisle, valued at ——. Barington vicarage, in the diocese of Ely, valued at £7. 14s. 4d. Blythe vicarage, in the diocese of York, valued at £14. 9s. 4d. Gryndon [Grendon] vicarage, in the diocese of Peterborough, valued at £8. Felmersham vicarage, in the diocese of Lincoln, valued at £13. 13s. 4d. Ware vicarage, in the diocese of London, valued at £20. 8s. 11d. Thunridge [Thundrich] vicarage, in the diocese of London, valued at £6. Swinstead [Swineshead] vicarage, in the diocese of Lincoln, valued at £14. 0s. 9d. Chedull [Cheadle] rectory, in the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield, valued at £12. 9s. See the livings in Michael House and King's Hall, pages 57, 61.

So that at this day there are therein maintained one Master, sixty Fellows, sixty-seven Scholars, four Conducts, three public Professors, thirteen Poor Scholars, twenty alms-men, (besides, lately, a Master of the Choristers, six Clerks, and ten Choristers,) with the Officers, Servants of the foundation, and other Students; in all, four hundred and forty.

20, 21. *Eminent Men in all Professions, with many more living.*

It is not much above a hundred years since the first founding of this House; and see how marvellously God hath blessed it with eminent men in all professions, besides the bishops afore-mentioned!

**STATESMEN.**—1. Sir Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor of England. 2. Sir Edward Coke, Lord Chief Justice. 3. Sir Edward Stanhope, Vicar-General. 4. Richard Cosin, LL.D. Dean of the

Arches. 5. Sir Robert Naunton, and, 6. Sir John Cooke, both Principal Secretaries of State. 7. Mr. John Packer, Secretary to the duke of Buckingham. 8. Sir Francis Nethersole, Secretary to the queen of Bohemia.

**DIVINES.**—1. Thomas Cartwright. 2. Walter Travers. 3. William Whitaker. 4. Matthew Sutcliffe, Founder of Chelsea College, Dean of Exeter. 5. John Layfield, 6. Thomas Harrison, and, 7. William Dakings, all three translators of the Bible.

**CRITICS.**—1. Edward Lively, one of the best linguists in the world. 2. Philemon Holland, an industrious translator. 3. William Alabaster, most skilful in cabalistical learning. 4. Edward Simpson, who hath written a large history, the mythological part whereof is most excellent. 6. Robert Creighton.

**POETS.**—1. Walter Hawkesworth, an excellent comedian. 2. Giles Fletcher, [author] of “Christ’s Victory.” 3. George Herbert, whose piety and poetry cannot be sufficiently commended. 4. Thomas Randolph.

Dr. Comber, the twelfth Master of this House, must not be forgotten; of whom the most learned Morinus\* makes this honourable mention:—*Alius præterea codex (Samaritanus) celebratur, et dicitur esse archiepiscopi Armachani, et ab eo e Palæstinâ in Hiberniam exportatus, qui Leydensibus Academicis nonnullo tempore fuit commodatus. Istum codicem vir clarissimus Thomas Comberus Anglus, quem honoris et officii reddendi causâ nomino, cum textu Judaico verbum e verbo, imò literam cum literâ maximâ diligentia et indefesso labore comparavit, differentiasque omnes juxta capitum et versuum ordinem digestas, ad me misit humanissimè et officiosissimè.*

Beside many worthies still alive: John Hacket, Doctor of Divinity, whose forwardness in farthering these my studies I can only deserve with my prayers: Dr. Henry Ferne, whose pen hath published his own worth: Master Herbert Thorndyke, so judicious and industrious in setting forth *the many-languaged Bible*: Mr. James Duport, so much the more prized by others, for his modest undervaluing his own worth: with many more, whose number God daily increase!

22, 23. *King’s Professors founded. Catalogues of them very imperfect.*

King Henry VIII. with Trinity College, founded also public Professors. For formerly the University had but two, one of Divinity, founded by the lady Margaret countess of Richmond,

\* *In Animad. in Censuram Exercitationum Ecclesiasticarum in Pentateuchum Samaritanum*, page 419.

(allowing him salary, of twenty marks,) and another for Physic, at the cost of Thomas Linacre, that excellent critic, tutor to prince Arthur, and afterwards Doctor of Physic. But now king Henry added to these a Regius Professor in Divinity, Law, Hebrew, and Greek, allowing them forty pounds *per annum*, and increasing the stipend of Physic Professor, now acknowledged as only of the king's foundation. But see the catalogue.

**LADY MARGARET'S PROFESSORS.**—John Fisher, President of Queen's College, bishop of Rochester. Erasmus Roterodamus. Thomas Cosin, D.D. Master of Corpus-Christi College. John Fawn, D.D. President of the University. Thomas Ashley, D.D. Fellow of King's College. William Sket, D.D. Fellow of King's College. Robert Beaumont, D.D. Master of Trinity College. Matthew Hutton, D.D. Master of Pembroke Hall. John Whitgift, D.D. Master of Trinity College. William Chaderton, D.D. President of Queen's College. Thomas Cartwright, Master of Arts, Fellow of Trinity College. John Hanson, Master of Arts, Fellow of Trinity College. John Still, D.D. Master of Trinity College. Peter Baro, a Frenchman, D.D. of Trinity College. Thomas Playford,\* D.D. Fellow of St. John's College. John Davenant, D.D. President of Queen's College. Samuel Ward, D.D. Master of Sidney-Sussex College. Richard Holdsworth, D.D. Master of Emmanuel College. Richard Love, D.D. Master of Corpus-Christi College.

**KING'S PROFESSORS IN DIVINITY.**—Dr. Wiggin. Martin Bucer, D.D. Dr. Sedgwick. Leonard Pilkington, D.D. Master of St. John's College. Matthew Hutton, D.D. Fellow of Trinity College. John Whitgift, D.D. Fellow of St. Peter's College. William Chaderton, D.D. Fellow of Christ's College. William Whitacre, D.D. Master of St. John's College. John Overhall, D.D. Master of St. Catherine's Hall. John Richardson, D.D. Fellow of Emmanuel, Master of Trinity. Samuel Collins, D.D. Provost of King's College. John Arrowsmith, D.D. Master of St. John's, and after of Trinity.

**KING'S LAW-PROFESSORS.**—Walter Haddon,† LL.D. Fellow of King's, Master of Trinity Hall. Thomas Bing, LL.D. Fellow of St. Peter's College, Master of Clare Hall. Thomas Legg, LL.D. Fellow of Jesus and Trinity Colleges, Master of Gonville and Caius College. John Cowell, LL.D. Fellow of King's College, Master of Trinity Hall. Thomas Morysonne, LL.D. Fellow

\* He is called Thomas Hayford by Le Neve, but Pleyfer and Playfer by Fuller, when he subsequently notices him as the successor of Baro, A. D. 1595-6, and announces his death, A. D. 1604-5. But his name was generally written Plaifere.—EDIT. † Sir Thomas Smith, [*justa*] *Rogeri Aschami Familiar. Epist. lib. ii. ad Brandisbaum.*

of King's College. George Porter, LL.D. Fellow of Queen's College. Thomas Goad, LL.D. Fellow of King's College.

**KING'S PHYSIC-PROFESSORS.**—John Blyth, Doctor of Physic, Fellow of King's College. John Hatcher, Doctor of Physic, Fellow of King's College. Thomas Larkin, Doctor of Physic, of St. Peter's College. William Ward, Doctor of Physic, Fellow of King's College. William Burton, Doctor of Physic, Fellow of King's College. John Gostlin, Doctor of Physic, Master of Gonville and Caius College. John Collins, Doctor of Physic, Fellow of St. John's College. Ralph Winterton, Doctor of Physic, Fellow of King's College. Francis Glisson, Doctor of Physic, Fellow of Gonville and Caius College.

**KING'S HEBREW-PROFESSORS.**—Mr. Robert Wakefield, Fellow. Anthony Rodolphus Cevallerius. Mr. Bignon, a Frenchman, of Corpus-Christi College. Edward Lively, Fellow of Trinity College. Robert Spalding, D.D. Fellow of St. John's College. Jeffery King, D.D. Fellow of King's College. Andrew Bing, D.D. Fellow of St. Peter's College. Robert Metcalfe, D.D. Fellow of St. John's College. Ralph Cudworth, Fellow of Emmanuel College.

**KING'S GREEK-PROFESSORS.**—Erasmus Roterodamus. Richard Crooke, Fellow of King's College. Sir Thomas Smith, knight, Fellow of Queen's College. Sir John Cheke, knight, tutor to king Edward VI. of St. John's College. Nicholas Carr, Fellow of Pembroke Hall, after of Trinity College. Bartholomew Doddington, Fellow of Trinity College. Francis Wilkinson, Fellow of Trinity College. Andrew Downes, Fellow of St. John's College. Robert Creighton, Fellow of Trinity College. James Duport, Fellow of Trinity College. Ralph Widdrington, Fellow of Christ's College.

These catalogues, though the best (not to say only) extant, are very imperfect. One instance I will give :—William Zoone, here omitted, was Regius Professor of Law, in the reign of queen Mary.\* But I dare not alter what so long hath been received.

John Madew,† Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Burman and Thomas Carlyle, Proctors; John Fann, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 7; Masters of Arts, 15; Bachelors of Arts, 29. A.D. 1546–47. 1 Edward VI.

\* PITZÆUS, *De Script. Anglic.* page 766.

† Instead of John Madew, Le Neve's list furnishes Matthew Parker as being this year (a second time) Vice-Chancellor; and Fuller's account does not agree with Le Neve's till the year 1553-4, when our historian resumes the regular series, by giving the names of Thomas Gardiner and Henry Barely, as Proctors for that year and the preceding; which was not correct.—  
EDIT.

**24—26. *The Lord Protector made Chancellor. The Insolencies of the Townsmen. Ascham's Letters procure Friends to the University.***

Great was the alteration which followed in Cambridge, upon king Edward's coming to the crown. Stephen Gardiner, Chancellor of the University, was put out of his office, and into the Tower. Edward Seymour, Lord Protector, and duke of Somerset, was chosen in his room.

The townsmen of Cambridge began now to hope their time come, to cast off the yoke (as they counted it) of the University; as if, on the alteration of religion, the ancient privileges of Scholars should be abolished, under the notion of superstition. Ungratefully, therefore, they began their pranks; I say, ungratefully. For, although particular Scholars might owe money to particular townsmen, yet the whole town owes its well-being to the University. Amongst their many insolencies, two were most remarkable: First, one Maxwell,\* by profession once a jail-keeper, then a bear-ward, promoted at last purveyor to provide carriages for the king's fish, (which commonly came from Cambridge,) seized on an ambling nag of the Master of Peter House, (which the old and infirm Doctor kept for his health,) merely that his man might thereon ride after the king's carriages. This horse, I may say, had a *long-reach*; the injury, seeming small and personal, concerned the whole University, both in present and posterity. Secondly, when the Proctors, at Sturbridge-fair, had, according to their office and ancient custom, fetched out many dissolute persons, out of vicious places, at unseasonable hours, the mayor refused to give them the keys of the toll-booth, or town-prison, to secure such offenders therein. Yea, when they had carried such malefactors to the Castle, within an hour or two comes the mayor's son, sets open the jail, and lets loose those lewd persons, to the great injury of the University, and encouragement of all viciousness.

It was now high time for Dr. Madew, the Vice-Chancellor, and Master Roger Ascham, the University-Orator, to bestir themselves. The latter be-lettered all the lords of the privy-council, and, amongst the rest, Sir Thomas Wriothesly, the Lord Chancellor of England, ( "whom," saith he, "the University partly commandeth, as once a member, partly requesteth, as now a patron, thereof," ) with some gentlemen of the king's bed-chamber; and, by them, procured the confirmation of the University-privileges in the following parliament. However, these oppidane animosities, in some degree, continued all this king's reign.

\* Compare Mr. Ascham's Letter to the Bishop of Winchester with his to the lord Wriothesly.

Matthew Parker, Vice-Chancellor; Edmond Grindall and Edward Gascoyne, Proctors; John Rust, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 14; Masters of Arts, 26; Bachelor of Laws, 1; Bachelors of Arts, 30. A.D. 1547-48.

27—29. *A Proffer of the Protector's to unite Clare and Trinity Hall; blasted by Bishop Gardiner.*

The lord protector by letters (which I have seen) solicited Stephen Gardiner, who still kept his Mastership of Trinity Hall, to resign his place and the whole Hall into the king's disposal; that so of that and its neighbour Clare Hall (whose Master, Dr. Madew, may be presumed compliable with the Protector's pleasure) one eminent and entire College might be advanced, on the king's cost, in imitation of Trinity College, the late royal result of three smaller foundations; wherein the civil and canon law (the skill whereof his Grace found necessary for the present well-being of the kingdom) should be countenanced and encouraged.

Most politic Gardiner, not without cause, suspecting some design or casualty might surprise the interval betwixt the dissolution of the old and erection of this new foundation, civilly declined his consent to the motion. He informed his Grace, that the way to advance the study of the laws was, by promoting the present Professors of that Faculty, (now so generally discouraged,) and not by founding a new College for the future students thereof, seeing Trinity Hall could alone breed more civilians than all England did prefer according to their deserts.

Thus was the design blasted, and never more mentioned. But Gardiner, for crossing the Protector herein, (and other misdemeanours,) soon after was outed of his Mastership of Trinity Hall, and first Dr. Haddon, then Dr. Mouse, substituted in his room.

William Bill, Vice-Chancellor; George Bullock and Philip Baker, Proctors; Richard Brakin, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Bachelor of Divinity, 1; Masters of Arts, 8; Bachelors of Arts, 32. A.D. 1548-49.

30. *An extraordinary Act before the King's Commissioners.*

Commissioners were sent from the king to visit the University; namely, Thomas Goodrich, bishop of Ely; Nicholas Ridley, bishop of Rochester; sir William Paget; sir Thomas Smith; sir John Cheke; William Mey, Doctor of Law; and Thomas Wendey, Doctor of Physic. Before these an extraordinary Act was kept, June 20th, wherein the QUESTIONS were, "1. Whether transubstantiation can be proved by plain and manifest words of Scrip-



ture ? ” 2. “ Whether it may be collected and confirmed by the consent of the Fathers, for these thousand years past ? ” ANSWERER : Dr. Madew, Protestant, held the negative. OPPONENTS : Dr. Glin, Masters Langedale, Sedgewick, and Yonge, Papists. MODERATORS : his majesty’s commissioners above mentioned.

June 24th, ANSWERER : Dr. Glin, Papist, held the affirmative. OPPONENTS : Masters Grindal, Perne, Gwest, and Pilkington, Protestants.

June 25th, ANSWERER : Mr. Perne, Protestant, held the negative. OPPONENTS : Masters Parker, (not Dr. Matthew Parker, but another of his name,) Pollard, Vavasour, and Yonge, Papists.

Bishop Ridley, according to the custom of the University, concluded all with a solemn determination. But the transactions of this disputation are so amply reported by Master Fox, that the sharpest appetite of his reader need not fear famishing, if he can keep himself from surfeiting thereon.

Walter Haddon, Vice-Chancellor ; Andrew Peerson and John Ebden, Proctors ; Alexander Raye, Mayor ; Bachelors of Divinity, 9 ; Masters of Arts, 17 ; Bachelors of Arts, 26. A.D. 1549–50.

### 31. *Northumberland made Chancellor.*

Edward duke of Somerset, and Chancellor of Cambridge, was much declined in his power at Court, though surviving some months after. Now the University had learned *to live by the living*, (in favour,) *and not by the dead* ; and therefore, chose John Dudley, duke of Northumberland, Chancellor, in place of Somerset.

### 32—35. *Bucer and Fagius called to Cambridge, made Professors there. The Death of Fagius. Tremellius, Hebrew Professor in Cambridge.*

Martin Bucer, and Paulus Fagius, (in Dutch, *Buchlein*, or Beecher,) living formerly at Strasburgh, at the instance of archbishop Cranmer, were sent for by king Edward, to become Professors in Cambridge. My author, a German, living then hard by, makes them to depart thence, *Magistratûs Argentinensis voluntate et consensu*, whom the Jesuit Parsons will have both banished by that State. If so, the disgrace is none at all, to be exiled for no other guilt than preaching the Gospel, opposing the Augustan Confession, which that imperial city embraced. Besides, the greater the providence, if, when commanded from one place, instantly called to another.

Over they come into England, and last year were fixed at Cam-

bridge, where Bucer was made Professor of Divinity, Fagius, of Hebrew. The former had the ordinary stipend of his place tripled unto him,\* as well it might, considering—his worth, being of so much merit—his need, having wife and children—and his condition, coming hither a foreigner, fetched from a far country. So it was ordered, that Fagius should in Hebrew read the evangelical prophet Isaiah, and Bucer, in Greek, the prophetical evangelist St. John.

But, alas ! the change of air and diet so wrought on their temper, that both fell sick together. Bucer hardly recovered ; but Fagius, that flourishing Beech, (nature not agreeing with his transplanting,) withered away in the flower of his age, (as scarce forty-five,) and was buried in the church of St. Michael.

After his death Emmanuel Tremellius was sent for to Cambridge, to succeed him in the Professor's place. There he lived some time, on this token, that Dr. Parker preferred him before many other friends to be godfather to his son, which Tremellius accounted a great favour.† But it seemeth, that, soon after, either affrighted with the valetudinous condition of king Edward, or allured with the bountiful proffers of the prince Palatine, he returned to Heidelberg.

John Madew, Vice-Chancellor ; Ralph Standish and William Coney, Proctors ; Christopher Franck, Mayor. He would not take his oath to the Vice-Chancellor till forced by the Lord Protector's letters.‡ Doctor of Divinity, 1 ; Doctors of Civil Law, 2 ; Doctor of Medicine, 1 ; Bachelors of Divinity, 4 ; Masters of Arts, 17 ; Bachelors of Arts, 37. A. D. 1550–51.

### 36. *Henry and Charles Brandon die of the Sweating-Sickness.*

Henry Brandon, duke of Suffolk, son of Charles Brandon, by Catherine lady Willoubie, died at Cambridge, (where he was a Student,) of the sweating-sickness.

Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, younger brother to the same Henry, died, within twelve hours, of the same disease. They were much bemoaned of the University, printing a book of verses on their funerals ; amongst which these following of Dr. Parkhurst's, afterward bishop of Norwich, I shall endeavour to translate.

*Fratres Amiclæi, Pollux cum Castore,  
Potuère sic cum morte depaciscier,  
Ut cum alter eorum esset mortuus, tamen  
Alter superesset, et, reversis sortibus,*

\* PANTALEON, *De Illustribus Germaniæ.*  
to his Chaldee Grammar.

† See Tremellius's own Preface

‡ CAIUS, *Hist. Cant. Acad. lib. 1. page 207.*

*Vicissim uterque utriusque morte viveret.  
 Cur Parca nunc crudelior est quam olim fuit ?  
 Fratres duos, nuper ea, quales hactenus,  
 Nec vidit unquam, nec videbit Anglia.  
 Lumina duo, duoque propugnacula  
 Fortissima virtutis reique publicæ,  
 Mors crudelis (ah) uno peremit funere  
 Virtus nequaquam illam, nec egregia indoles  
 Movit, nec Edvardi regis, nec optimæ  
 Matris, nec totius gemitus Britannicæ.  
 O dura, dura Mors, O sæva numina !*

## THE SAME IN ENGLISH.

CASTOR and Pollux, brothers pair,  
 Breathing first Amicle's air,  
 Did with Death so bargain make,  
 By exchange their turns to take :  
 If that Death surprised one brother,  
 Still alive should be the other.  
 So the bargain was contrived,  
 Both died, both by turns survived.  
 Why is Fate more cruel grown  
 Than she formerly was known ?  
 We of brothers had a brace,  
 Like to which did never grace  
 This our English earth before,  
 Nor the like shall grace it more.  
 Both bright stars ; and both did stand  
 Hopeful bulwarks of the land.  
 Both, alas ! together slain,  
 Death at once did murder twain.  
 Nothing could their virtues move,  
 Nor king Edward's hearty love,  
 Nor their best of mother's moans,  
 Nor all Britain's heavy groans.  
 Nothing could stern Death abate :  
 O cruel, over-cruel Fate !

Many in Cambridge died of this sweating-sickness, patients mending or ending in twenty-four hours. Some sought for the natural cause thereof out of the heavens, imputing it to the conjunction of the superior planets in Scorpio. Others looked for it from the earth, as arising from an exhalation in moist weather out of gypseous or plasterly ground. The cure thereof (conceived impossible before, and easy as all things else after, it was found out) was, in the night-time to keep him in [bed], in the day-time

(if then seized on) to send the sick man (though in his clothes) to bed, there to lie still, but not sleep, for four-and-twenty hours.\* Nothing else have I to observe of this sickness, save that I find foreigners call it "the English sweating," as first arising hence; whilst diseases more sinful (though, it may be, not so mortal) take their names from our neighbouring countries.

Andrew Perne, Vice-Chancellor; Edward Hauford, Thomas Yade, and Nicholas Robinson, Proctors; William Gill, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Doctor of Civil Law, 1; Doctors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 3; Masters of Arts, 22; Bachelors of Laws, 3; Bachelors of Arts, 42. A.D. 1551–52.

### 37. *Several Dates of Bucer's Death.*

Martin Bucer ended his life, and was buried in St. Mary's; several authors assigning sundry dates of his death.

Martin Crusius (in *Annal. Suev.* part 3, lib. ii. cap. 25) makes him to die A.D. 1551, on the second of February. Pantaleon (*De Viris illustribus Germaniæ*) makes him expire about the end of April of the same year. Mr. Fox, in his "Reformed Almanack," appoints the twenty-third of December for Bucer's confessorship.† A printed Table of the Chancellors of Cambridge, set forth by Dr. Perne, signeth March the tenth, 1550, for the day of his death. Nor will the distinction of old and new style (had it been then in use) help to reconcile the difference. It seems by all reports, that Bucer was sufficiently dead in or about this time.

### 38. *A loud Lie of a lewd Jesuit.*

Persons, the Jesuit,† tells us, that some believed that he died a Jew, merely, I conceive, because he lived a great Hebrician; citing Surius, Genebrand, and Lindan (ask my fellow if I be a liar) for this report. Sure I am, none of them were near him at his death, as Mr. Bradford and others were; who, when they admonished him, in his sickness, that he should arm himself against the assaults of the devil, answered, that he had nothing to do with the devil, because he was wholly in Christ. And when Mr. Bradford came to him, and told him that he must die, he answered, *Ille, ille regit, et moderatur omnia*, and so quietly yielded up his soul. What good man would not rather die like a Jew with Martin Bucer, than like a Christian with Robert Persons? He was a plain man in person and apparel; and therefore, at his own request, privately created Doctor, without any solemnity; a skilful linguist,

\* See CAMDEN'S *Britannia* in Shropshire.  
death on the same.

† Which may probably intimate his  
‡ In his "Examen of John Fox's Saints' Kalendar for  
*December*," page 330.

whom a great critic \* (of a palate not to be pleased with a common gust) styleth *ter maximum Bucerum*, a commendation which he justly deserved.

Edwin Sandys, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Gardiner and Henry Barely, Proctors; Thomas Woolf, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 4; Bachelors of Divinity, 16; Masters of Arts, 19; Bachelors of Arts, 48. A.D. 1552-53. 1 Mary.

### 39. *Queen Mary secretly passeth into Suffolk.*

The lady Mary, after her brother's death, having heard queen Jane was proclaimed, July 11th, came five miles off to sir Robert Huddleston's, where she heard mass. Next day, July 12th, Sir Robert waited on her into Suffolk, though she, for the more secrecy, rode on horseback behind his servant; which servant (as I am most credibly informed) lived long after, the queen never bestowing any preferment upon him; whether because forgetting him, (whose memory was employed on greater matters,) or because she conceived the man was rewarded in rewarding his master. Indeed, she bestowed great boons on sir Robert; and amongst the rest the stones of Cambridge Castle, to build his house at Salston.† Hereby that stately structure, anciently the ornament of Cambridge, is at this day reduced next to nothing.

### 40—43. *Dr. Sandys preacheth before the Duke of Northumberland. The Duke's retrograde Motion. Read, and wonder at human Uncertainty. The hard Usage of Dr. Sandys.*

John Dudley, duke of Northumberland, came, July 15th, to Cambridge with his army, and a commission to apprehend the lady Mary. At night he sent for Dr. Sandys, the Vice-Chancellor, and some other Heads of Houses, to sup with him. He enjoined the Vice-Chancellor to preach before him the next day. The Doctor late at night betakes himself to his prayers and study, desiring God to direct him to a fit text for that time. His Bible opens at the first of Joshua, and (though he heard no voice, with St. Augustine, *Tolle et lege*) a strong fancy inclined him to fix on the first words he beheld, namely: "And they answered Joshua, saying, All that thou commandest us, we will do; and whithersoever thou sendest us, we will go." (Joshua i. 16.) A fit text indeed for him, as in the event it proved, to whom it occasioned much sanctified affliction. However, so wisely and warily he handled the words, that his enemies got not so full advantage against him as they expected.

\* VOSSIIUS, in *Thesi de Statu Animæ separatæ*.

† CAIUS, *Hist. Cant. Acad.*

Next day, July 17th, the duke advanced to Bury with his army, whose feet marched forward, whilst their minds moved backward. He, hearing that the country came in to the lady Mary, and proclaimed her queen, returned to Cambridge, July 18th, with more sad thoughts within him than valiant soldiers about him. Then went he with (if he sent not for) the mayor of the town, and in the market-place proclaimed queen Mary; the beholders whereof more believed the grief confessed in his eyes when they let down tears, than the joy professed by his hands when he cast up his cap. The same night he was arrested of high treason by Roger Slegge, Serjeant at Arms, even in King's College, which is fenced with privileges more than any other foundation in the University. Here Oxford-men will tell us, how their University would not surrender up Robert Stillington, bishop of Bath and Wells,\* when in the reign of king Edward IV. convict of high treason, but stood on their academical immunities. But Cambridge is sensible of no privileges inconsistent with allegiance; accounting, in the first place, "God's service perfect freedom," and, next to it, loyalty to her sovereign the greatest liberty. As for the duke, though soon after he was set at liberty, on the general proclamation of pardon, yet the next day, July 19th, he was re-arrested of high treason, by the earl of Arundel, at whose feet the duke fell down, to crave his mercy; a low posture in so high a person! But what more poor and prostrate than pride itself, when reduced to extremity!

Behold we this duke as the mirror of human unhappiness. As Neville earl of Warwick was *the make-king*, so this Dudley earl of Warwick (his title before lately-created duke) was *the make-queen*. He was Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, and also *Senescallus* ("High-Steward," as I take it) of the town of Cambridge, two offices which never before or since met in the same person. Thus, as Cambridge was his *vertical* place, wherein he was in height of honour; it was also his *vertical*, where he met with a sudden turn and sad catastrophe. And it is remarkable, that, though this duke (who by all means endeavoured to engrand his posterity) had six sons, all men, all married, none of them left any issue behind them. Thus, far better it is to found our hopes of (even earthly) happiness on goodness than on greatness.

Dr. Sandys, hearing the bell ring, went, according to his custom and office, attended with the beadles, into the Regent-House, and sat down in the Chair, according to his place. In cometh one Master Mitch, with a rabble of some twenty Papists, some endeavouring to pluck him from the Chair, others, the Chair from him, all using railing words and violent actions. The Doctor, being a

\* BRIAN TWYNE, *Antiq. Acad. Oxon.* page 263.

man of metal, groped for his dagger, and probably had dispatched some of them, had not Dr. Bill and Dr. Blythe, by their prayers and entreaties, persuaded him to patience. How afterwards this Doctor was spoiled of his goods, sent up prisoner to London, how with great difficulty he was enlarged, and [with] great danger escaped beyond the seas, is largely related by Master Fox.

#### 44. *Masters placed and displaced.*

Some two years since, Cambridge had her sweating-sickness, but now began her hot fit, or fiery trial indeed. For, on the execution of the duke of Northumberland, Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, was restored Chancellor of Cambridge; then followed an alteration of Masters in most Houses. However, let us give unto Dr. Perne his deserved praise, that he quenched the fire of persecution (or rather suffered it not to be kindled) in Cambridge, saving many from the stake by his moderation; and let us give in a list of the great alteration, in the Masters of Houses, which the first year of this queen did produce.

MASTERS PUT OUT.	COLLEGES.	MASTERS PUT IN.
1. Ralph Ainsworth, because he was married.	Peter House.	Andrew Perne, dean of Ely.
2. Dr. John Madew, who had been three times Vice-Chancellor.	Clare Hall.	Dr. Rowland Swinburn, rector of Little-Shelford in Cambridgeshire.
3. Nicholas Ridley, still holding his Mastership, with the bishopric of London.	Pembroke Hall.	John Young, Fellow of St. John's, a zealous Papist, and opposite to Bucer.
4. Matthew Parker, dean of Lincoln.	Benc't College.	Laurence Maptide, Fellow of Trinity Hall.
5. William Mouse, Doctor of Law, and a benefactor.	Trinity Hall.	Stephen Gardiner, then bishop of Winchester, and Lord Chancellor of England.
6. Sir John Cheke, knight, tutor to king Edward VI.	King's College.	Richard Adkinson, Doctor of Divinity.



MASTERS PUT OUT	COLLEGES.	MASTERS PUT IN.
7. William May, Doctor of Law, Chancellor to Nicholas West, bishop of Ely.	Queen's College.	William Glyn, Doctor of Divinity, afterward bishop of Bangor.
8. Edwin Sandys, Vice-Chancellor in this year.	Catherine Hall.	Edmund Cosins, born in Bedfordshire.
9. Edward Pierpoint, Doctor of Divinity.	Jesus College.	John Fuller, prebend of Ely, Vicar General to Thomas Thurlby, bishop thereof.
10. Richard Wilkes, Master of the Hospital of St. John's, and Mary Magdalene, in Ely.	Christ's College.	Cuthbert Scot, afterwards bishop of Chester.
11. Thomas Leaver, Bachelor of Divinity, a Confessor, in the reign of queen Mary, at Arrough, in Switzerland.	St. John's Coll.	Thomas Watson, afterward bishop of Lincoln.

I find but two continuing in their places; namely, Thomas Bacon, Master of Gonville Hall, and Robert Evans, Master of Magdalen College, then so poor a place, that it was scarce worth acceptance thereof.

John Young, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Gardiner and Henry Barely, Proctors; Thomas Woolf, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 4; Bachelors of Divinity, 16; Masters of Arts, 19; Bachelors of Arts, 48. A.D. 1553-54.

William Glynne and Cuthbert Scot, Vice-Chancellors; Thomas Baylie and Gregory Garth, Proctors; John Richardson, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Doctor of Laws, 1; Doctors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 3; Masters of Arts, 33; Bachelors of Laws, 4; Bachelors of Arts, 43. 1554-55.

Cuthbert Scot, Vice-Chancellor; George Boyse and John Gwyn, Proctors; Richard Brassy, Mayor; Doctor of Canon Law, 1;\*

\* That was the last Doctor that ever commenced in Cambridge of Canon Law alone; which, as a distinct faculty, was banished by king Henry VIII. and (it seems) for a short time was restored by queen Mary.

Bachelors of Divinity, 6 ; Masters of Arts, 27 ; Bachelors of Arts, 37. 1555–56.

Andrew Pern, Vice-Chancellor ; Nicholas Robinson and Hugo Glyn, Proctors ; Thomas Smith, Mayor ; Doctors of Divinity, 4 ; Doctors of Laws, 2 ; Bachelors of Divinity, 4 ; Masters of Arts, 27 ; Bachelors of Laws, 5 ; Bachelor of Medicine, 1 ; Bachelors of Arts, 27. 1556–57.

Robert Brassey, Vice-Chancellor ; William Golden and William Day, Proctors ; William Hasell, Mayor ; Doctors of Medicine, 2 ; Bachelor of Divinity, 1 ; Masters of Arts, 22 ; Bachelor of Laws, 1 ; Bachelors of Arts, 41. 1557–58.

45—51. *Dr. Caius foundeth Caius College ; giveth it good Land, and good Building, good Statutes, a new Name, and hieroglyphical Arms. No violent Papist.*

John Caius, Doctor of Physic, improved the ancient Hall of Gonville into a new College, of his own name. He was born in Norwich, but son of Robert Caius, a Yorkshireman ; spent much of his time in the Italian Universities, there making many, translating more, learned books ; and after his return was physician to queen Mary. He bestowed a fivefold favour on this his foundation.

First. Land to a great proportion. So untrue is his cavil, *Nescio quid paucillum*,\* as if it were some small, inconsiderable matter ; whereas, indeed, he conferred thereon the demesnes of Crokesley, in Rickmansworth, in Hertfordshire ; Bincombe manor, in Dorsetshire ; (with the advowson of the parsonage ; ) Runcton and Burnhams-Thorp, in Norfolk ; the manor of Swansly, at Caxton, in Cambridgeshire.

Secondly. Building ; adding a new court, of his own charge, and therein three gates of remark : *The gate of humility*, low and little, opening into the street over against St. Michael's church : *the gate of virtue*, one of the best pieces of architecture in England, in the midst of the College : thirdly, *the gate of honour*, leading to the Schools. Thus the gates may read a good lecture of morality to such who go in and out thereat. He ordered also that no new windows be made in their College, new lights causing the decay of old structures.

Thirdly. He bestowed on them cordial statutes, (as I may call them,) for the preserving of the College in good health ; being so prudent and frugal, it must needs thrive, (in its own defence,) if but observing the same. Thence it is, this Society hath always been on the purchasing hand, (having a fair proportion annually

\* *Res Platonius*, page 216 in *margin*.

deposited in stock,) and indeed oweth its plenty, under God, unto its own providence, rather than the bounty of any eminent benefactor,—the Masters only excepted, who, for so many successions, have been bountiful unto it, that the College (in a manner) may now prescribe for their benefaction.

Fourthly. He gave it a new name, to be called Gonville and Caius College. But as in the conjunction of two Roman consuls, Bibulus and Caius Julius Cæsar, the former was eclipsed by the lustre of the latter, so this his namesake Caius hath in some sort obscured his partner, carrying away the name of the College in common discourse.

Lastly. He procured a coat of arms, for the College to bear it impaled with that of Gonville. Indeed, they are better hieroglyphics than heraldry, fitter to be *reported* than *blazoned*; and, betwixt both, we dare adventure on them. Namely, in the *field*, or, bescattered with *purple ears of amaranth*; two serpents erected, *azure*, with their tails nowed or knotted together, upon a pedestal of marble, *vert*,\* having a branch of *semper vivum* proper betwixt their heads, and a *book, sable*, with *golden buttons*, betwixt their bodies; wherein, not to descend to particulars, Wisdom is designed, in a stable posture, by the embracing of Learning, to attain to uncorrupted immortality;† or, to take the words of the patent, *ex prudentiâ, et literis, virtutis petrâ firmatis immortalitas*. He lieth buried in the chapel, under a plain tomb and plainer epitaph, as without words having one word fewer, “FUI CAIUS.”

Some since have sought to blast his memory, by reporting him a papist; no great crime to such who consider the time when he was born, and foreign places wherein he was bred. However, this I dare say in his just defence,—he never mentioneth protestants but with due respect, and sometimes, occasionally, doth condemn the superstitious credulity of popish miracles.‡ Besides, after he had resigned his Mastership to Dr. Legge, he lived Fellow-Commoner in the College; and, having built himself a little seat in the chapel, was constantly present at protestant prayers. If any say, all this amounts but to a lukewarm religion, we leave the heat of his faith to God’s sole judgment, and the light of his good works to men’s imitation.

MASTERS.—1. John Caius. 2. Thomas Legge. 3. William Branthwaite. 4. John Gostlin. 5. Thomas Bachcroft. 6. William Dell.

BISHOPS.—Francis White, bishop of Ely.

BENEFACTORS.—Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury.

\* No natural colour.

† *Sceletos Cantabrigiæ*, MS.

‡ *Historia Cantab.*

*lib. i. page 8, Quamquam illius ævi cæcitas admirationem, &c.*

Robert Traps, and Joan his wife, Joyce Franklin, their daughter. Dr. Wendie. Dr. Bishbie. Dr. Harvey. Sir William Paston, knight. William Cutting. Dr. Legge. Dr. Branthwaite. Dr. Gostlin, late Master of this House. Dr. Perse, and Dr. Wells, late Fellows.

LEARNED WRITERS.—John White. Francis White. — Fletcher, famous for his book *De Urinis*. William Watts, D.D. He set forth Matthew Paris. Jeremy Taylor, D.D.

COLLEGE-LIVING.—Bincombe rectory, in the diocese of Bristol, valued at £9. 1s. 5d.

So that lately (namely, *anno* 1634) there were one Master, twenty-five Fellows, one Chaplain, sixty-nine Scholars, besides Officers and Servants of the foundation, with other Students; the whole number being two hundred and nine.

### 52. *A numerous Nursery of eminent Physicians.*

Dr. Caius may seem to have bequeathed a medicinal genius unto this foundation, as may appear by this catalogue:—

1. Stephen Perse. 2. William Rant, senior. 3. William Harvey. 4. Thomas Grimston. 5. John Gostlin. 6. Robert Wells. 7. Oliver Green. 8. Nicholas Brown. 9. Joseph Micklewaite. 10. Francis Prujean. 11. William Rant, junior. 12. Edmund Smith. 13. Richard Curtis. 14. Francis Glisson. 15. Richard London. 16. Henry Glisson. 17. Robert Eade. 18. Joseph Dey. 19. Thomas Buckenham. 20. William Ringall. 21. Charles Scarborough. 22. Thomas Prujean. 23. Robert Waller. 24. Abner Coo. 25. William French. 26. Christopher Ludkin. 27. William Bagge.

All bred in this House, Doctors of Physic, and extant in my memory: such a little Montpelier is this College alone for eminent physicians! And now we take our leave thereof, acknowledging myself much beholden to Master More, late Fellow, an industrious and judicious antiquary, for many rarities imparted unto me.

### 53, 54. *Cardinal Pole Chancellor both of Cambridge and Oxford. His Visitation of Cambridge.*

Upon the death of Stephen Gardiner, Reginald Pole, cardinal, archbishop of Canterbury, was chosen Chancellor of Cambridge. I admire, therefore, at Master Brian Twyne's peremptoriness, when affirming, *Reginaldus Polus non Cantabrigiensis (quod Londinensis falsò affirmat) sed Oxoniensis fuit Cancellarius*, if HE was to be believed before our records. Indeed, Pole was Chancellor of both Universities at the same time; and as now Cambridge chose

an Oxford-man for their Chancellor, Oxford afterward made election of one of Cambridge, namely, Richard Bancroft, archbishop of Canterbury.

The cardinal kept a visitation in Cambridge by his power legatine, wherein the bones of Bucer and Fagius were burned to ashes, and many superstitions established; so largely related by Mr. Fox, our industry can add nothing thereunto. The best is, the effects of this visitation lasted not long, [being] rescinded in the next year by the coming-in of queen Elizabeth.

Edmund Cousin and John Pory, Vice-Chancellors; Richard Smith and John Bell, Proctors; John Line and Milo Prance, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctor of Laws, 1; Doctors of Medicine, 2; Bachelor of Divinity, 1; Masters of Arts, 22; Bachelors of Arts, 28. A.D. 1558–59. 1 Elizabeth.

### 55. *Cambridge visited by Queen Elizabeth's Commissioners.*

On the death of cardinal Pole, sir William Cecil, afterward lord Burleigh, was made Chancellor of Cambridge, being so great a friend thereunto, nothing can be said enough in his commendation. Then followed a visitation of Cambridge, *jure regio*, wherein with the foresaid Chancellor were adjoined Anthony Cook, knight; Matthew Parker, William Bill, Richard Horn, James Pilkington, Doctors of Divinity; William May, Walter Haddon, Doctors of Laws; and Thomas Wendie, Doctor of Physic, and physician to her Majesty. What alteration this produced, the ensuing catalogue will inform.

MASTERS PUT OUT.	COLLEGES.	MASTERS PUT IN.
1. Dr. Rowland Swinburn.	Clare Hall.	Dr. John Madew, thrice Vice-Chancellor.
2. Dr. John Young.	Pembroke Hall.	Dr. Edmund Grindal.
3. Dr. William Mouse.	Trinity Hall.	Dr. Henry Harvey.
4. Dr. Robert Brassey.	King's College.	Dr. Philip Baker.
5. Thomas Peacock, Bachelor of Divinity.	Queen's College.	Dr. William May, restored.
6. Dr. Edmund Cosins.	Catherine Hall.	Dr. John May.
7. Dr. John Fuller.	Jesus College.	Dr. Thomas Redman.
8. Dr. William Taylor.	Christ College.	Dr. Edmund Hawford.
9. Dr. George Bullock.	St. John's College.	Dr. James Pilkington.

## MASTERS PUT OUT.

## COLLEGES.

## MASTERS PUT IN.

10. Dr. Richard Car (*sed quære*). Magdalen College. Dr. Roger Kelke.
11. Dr. John Christopher-son, bishop of Chester. Trinity College. Dr. William Bill, restored.

Dr. Caius, Master of his own College, (and very good reason,) still continued therein, so did Dr. Andrew Perne in Peter House. Hence the Scholars in merriment made (and for some years kept) the Latin word, (unknown in that sense to Varro or Priscian,) *Perno*, "to turn or change often," avouched by no other author than this Doctor's unconstancy. However, let us not be over cruel to his memory, for not suffering for his own—who was so kind and careful to keep others from suffering for their—conscience.

Andrew Perne, Vice-Chancellor; Bartholomew Dodington and George Fuller, Proctors; Thomas Ventris, Mayor; Doctors of Laws, 3; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 6; Masters of Arts, 25; Bachelors of Arts, 60. A.D. 1559–60.

Henry Harvey, Vice-Chancellor; Anthony Giblington and John Cowell, Proctors; Roger Slegg, Mayor; Doctor of Laws, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 9; Masters of Arts, 31; Bachelor of Laws, 1; Bachelors of Music, 2; Bachelors of Arts, 53; 1560–61.

Philip Baker, Vice-Chancellor; William Masters and George Blythe, Proctors; Thomas Kimbold, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Doctors of Laws, 2; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 8; Masters of Arts, 20; Bachelors of Laws, 3; Bachelors of Arts, 51. 1561–62.

Francis Newton, Vice-Chancellor; Andrew Oxenbridge and John Igulden, Proctors; Henry Serle, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Doctor of Laws, 1; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 4; Masters of Arts, 44; Bachelors of Laws, 7; Bachelors of Arts, 80. 1562–63.

Edward Hawford, Vice-Chancellor; Richard Curtesse and Henry Worley, Proctors; Robert Cano, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 12; Doctor of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 4; Masters of Arts, 39; Bachelors of Laws, 2; Bachelors of Arts, 71. 1563–64.

Robert Beaumont, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Bing and Bartholomew Clark, Proctors; William Munsey, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 7; Masters of Arts, 27; Bachelors of Arts, 85. 1564–65.

Now began a great difference in Trinity College, betwixt Dr. Beaumont, Master thereof, and some in that Society, which hath its influence at this day on the Church of England ; whereof hereafter.

## SECTION VIII.

TO FRANCIS ASH, OF LONDON, ESQUIRE.

It is the life of a gift, to be done in the life of the giver ; far better than funeral legacies, which, like Benjamin, are born by the loss of a parent. For, it is not so kindly charity, for men to give what they can keep no longer : besides, such donations are most subject to abuses.

Silver in *the living*  
Is gold in the giving ;  
Gold in *the dying*  
Is but silver a-flying ;  
Gold and silver in *the dead*  
Turn too often into lead.

But you have made your own hands executors ; and eyes, overseers ; so bountiful to a flourishing foundation in Cambridge, that you are above the standard of a benefactor.\* Longer may you live, for the glory of God, and good of his servants !

1—3. *Queen Elizabeth comes to Cambridge. Her Oration to the University. Noblemen made Masters of Arts.*

Queen Elizabeth, partly to ease herself with some recreation, partly to honour and encourage learning and religion, came to Cambridge, Aug. 5th, where she remained five whole days, in the lodgings of the Provost of King's College. She was entertained with comedies, tragedies, orations, (whereof one most eloquent,) made by William Masters, (the Public Orator,) disputations, and other academical exercises. She severally visited every House ; and at her departure, August 10th, she took her leave of Cambridge, with this following oration :—

\* See a succeeding page, (207).—EDLT.



*Etsi feminilis iste meus pudor (subditi fidelissimi et Academia charissima) in tantâ doctorum turbâ illaboratum hunc sermonem et orationem me narrare apud vos impediat; tamen nobilium meorum intercessus, et erga Academiam benevolentia me aliqua proferre invitât. Duobus ad hanc rem stimulis moveor. Primus est bonarum literarum propagatio. Alter est vestra omnium expectatio. Quod ad propagationem spectat, unum illud apud Demosthenem memini: "Superiorum verba apud inferiores librorum locum habent, et principum dicta legum auctoritatem apud subditos retinent." Hoc igitur vos omnes in memoriâ tenere velim, quod semita nulla præstantior est sive ad bona fortune acquirenda, sive ad principum gratiam conciliandam, quàm graviter (ut cœpistis) studiis vestris exhibeatis operam: quod ut faciatis vos omnes oro obsecroque. De secundo stimulo, vestrâ nimirum expectatione, hoc unum dico, me nihil libenter prætermisuram esse, quod vestras de me animas benevolas concipiunt cogitationes. Jam ad Academiam venio: tempore antemeridiano vidi ego ædificia vestra sumptuosa a meis majoribus clarissimis principibus literarum causâ extracta, et inter videndum dolor artus meos occupavit, atque ea mentis suspiria quæ Alexandrum quondam tenuisse feruntur; qui cum legisset multa a principibus monumenta, conversus ad familiarem, seu potius ad consiliarium, multum doluit se nihil tale fecisse. Hæc tamen vulgaris sententia me aliquantum recreavit, quæ etsi non auferre, tamen minuere, potest dolorem; quæ quidem sententia hæc est: "Romam non uno ædificatam fuisse die." Tamen non est ita senilis mea ætas, nec tam diu fui ex quo regnare cœpi, quin ante redditionem debiti naturæ (si non nimis citò Atropos lineam vitæ meæ amputaverit) aliquod opus faciam, et quamdiu vita hos regit artus nunquam a proposito deflectam. Et si contingat (quam citò futurum sit, nescio) me mori oportere, priusquàm hoc ipsum quod polliceor complere possim, aliquod tamen egregium opus post mortem relinquam, quo et memoria mea in posterum celebris fiat, et alios excitens exemplo meo, et vos omnes alacriores faciam ad studia vestra. Sed jam videtis quantum intersit inter doctrinam lectam, et disciplinam animo non retentam. Quorum alterius sunt complures satis sufficientes testes, alterius autem vos omnes nimis quidem inconsideratè testes hoc tempore effeci, quæ meo barbaro orationis genere tam diu doctas vestras aures detinuerim. DIXI.*

At that time the Degree of Master of Arts was conceived to take a degree, and itself commenced in honour when the following peers and noble persons were, in the Regent-House, created Masters of Arts:—Thomas Howard,\* duke of Norfolk; Edward Vere, earl of Oxford; Ambrose Dudley, earl of Warwick; Edward Manners,

\* CAIUS, *Historia Acad. Cantab.* page 88.

earl of Rutland; Thomas Ratslyf, earl of Sussex; Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester; Edward Clinton, high admiral of England; William Howard, lord chamberlain; Henry Carew, lord Hunsden; sir William Cecil, secretary; sir Francis Knolls, vice-chamberlain; Thomas Heneage, esq. John Ashley, esq. Richard Bartue, esq. William Cooke, esq. Edmond Cooke, esq.

Thus, Acts being ended, Degrees conferred, University-Officers well rewarded, and all persons pleased, her majesty went on in her progress, and the Scholars returned to their studies.

*4, 5. The first Cause of Mr. Cartwright's Discontentment. The same disavowed by his Followers.*

And yet we find one great Scholar much discontented, if my author\* may be believed; namely, Mr. Thomas Cartwright. He and Thomas Preston (then Fellow of King's College, afterwards Master of Trinity Hall) were appointed two of the four disputants in the Philosophy-Act, before the queen. Cartwright had dealt most with the Muses, Preston with the Graces, adorning his learning with comely carriage, graceful gesture, and pleasing pronunciation. Cartwright disputed like a *great*, Preston like a *gentle*, scholar, being a handsome man; and the queen, upon parity of deserts, always preferred properness of person in conferring her favours. Hereupon, with her looks, words, and deeds, she favoured Preston, calling him her scholar, as appears by his epitaph, in Trinity-Hall chapel, which thus beginneth:—

*Conderis hoc tumulto Thomæ Prestone, scholarem  
Quem dixit princeps Elizabetha suum.*

Inasmuch, that, for his good disputing, and excellent acting in the tragedy of "Dido," she bestowed on him a pension of twenty pounds a-year; whilst Mr. Cartwright, saith my author,† received neither reward nor commendation, whereof he not only complained to his inward friends in Trinity College, but also, after her majesty's neglect of him, began to wade into divers opinions against her ecclesiastical government.

But Mr. Cartwright's followers (who lay the foundation of his disaffection to the discipline established in his conscience, not carnal discontentment) credit not the relation; adding moreover, that the queen did highly commend,‡ though not reward, him. But, whatever was the cause, soon after, he went beyond the seas, and after his travels returned a bitter enemy to the hierarchy.

John Stokes, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Bing and Thomas Pres-

\* SIR GEORGE PAUL, in "The Life of Archbishop Whitgift," page 7.

† See

Mr. HATCHER'S MS. of the Fellows of King's College, 1553.

‡ See his "Life,"

lately set forth by Mr. Clarke.

ton, Proctors; Christopher Fletcher, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctor of Medicine 1; Bachelor of Divinity, 1; Masters of Arts, 46; Bachelors of Laws, 2; Bachelors of Arts, 86. A.D. 1564–65.

Robert Beaumont and Roger Kelke, Vice-Chancellors; Nicholas Shephard and Edward Deering, Proctors; Alexander Ray, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 4; Doctor of Laws, 1; Doctors of Medicine, 4; Masters of Arts, 45; Bachelor of Laws, 1; Bachelors of Arts, 86. 1565–66.

Richard Longworth, Vice-Chancellor; Christopher Lindley and John Dawbeny, Proctors; Thomas Kimbold, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 0; Doctors of Laws, 2; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 4; Masters of Arts, 59; Bachelors of Laws, 2; Bachelor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Arts, 118. 1566–67.

*6, 7. The Factions in Trinity College. Whitgift and Cartwright clash in the Schools.*

John Whitgift, Master of Pembroke Hall, is made Master of Trinity College, which he found distempered with many opinions, which Mr. Cartwright, lately returned from beyond seas, had raised therein; and on a Sunday, July 4th, in Dr. Whitgift's absence, Mr. Cartwright and two of his adherents made three sermons on one day in the chapel, so vehemently inveighing against the ceremonies of the church, that at evening prayer all the Scholars, save three, (namely, Dr. Legge, Mr. West, Whitaker's tutor, and the Chaplain,) cast off their surplices, as an abominable relic of superstition.\*

Whitgift was Master of the College, and the queen's [Professor of Divinity], Cartwright but Fellow thereof, and the lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity. Great clashing was now in the Schools, when one Professor impugned—the other asserted—the church-discipline in England. Cartwright's followers would fain have it believed, that the emulation was inflamed betwixt them, because Whitgift's lectures and sermons were not so frequented, whilst all flocked after Cartwright; insomuch that when he preached at St. Mary's, the clerk thereof was fain to take down the windows of the church. Yea, Mr. Cartwright did not only oppose the matter, but also the manner and method, of Mr. Whitgift's lectures, as may appear by what afterwards was printed by both, the one objecting what is thus answered by the other.

THOMAS CARTWRIGHT.—“They which have heard Mr. Doctor read in the Schools can tell that he, being there amongst learned men, never used to reduce the contrary arguments of the adversa-

\* SIR GEORGE PAUL, in “Whitgift's Life,” page 9.

ries to the places of the fallacious; and yet that was the fittest place for him to have showed his knowledge in, because there they should have been best understood." \*

JOHN WHITGIFT.—“Touching my reading in the Schools, (which you here opprobriously object unto me,) though I know that the University had a far better opinion of me than I deserved, and that there were a great many which were in all respects better able to do that office than myself, yet I trust I did my duty, and satisfied them. What logic I uttered in my lectures, and how I read, I refer to their judgments; who surely, if they suffered me so long to continue in that place, augmented the stipend for my sake, and were so desirous to have me still to remain in that function, (reading so unlearnedly as you would make the world believe I did,) may be thought either to be without judgment themselves, or else to have been very careless for that exercise.” †

The result of the difference betwixt them is this, that, (leaving the controversy itself to the judgment of others,) if Cartwright had the better of it in his learning, Whitgift had the advantage in his temper; and, which is the main, he had more power to back, if fewer people to follow, him.

John Young, Vice-Chancellor; John Wells, Edmund Rokery, and William Lewin, Proctors; Roger Slegg, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 5; Doctors of Civil Law, 6; Doctors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 22; Masters of Arts, 62; Practitioner in Surgery, 1; Bachelors of Laws, 2; Bachelors of Arts, 86.  
A. D. 1568–69.

Nicholas Carre, Fellow of Pembroke Hall, a great restorer of learning in this University, wherein he was Professor of Greck, (first as substitute to sir John Cheke, in his absence, then,) in his own capacity discharging the place fifteen years, (afterwards resigning the same, and commencing Doctor of Physic,) this year ended his life, to the great grief of all godly and learned men. He was buried in St. Giles's church, beyond the bridge, under a handsome monument, with this epitaph:—

*Hic jaceo Carrus, doctos doctissimus inter  
Tempore quos fovit Granta diserta meo.  
Tam mihi Cecropiæ, Latia quam gloria lingua  
Convenit, et medicæ maximus artis honos.  
Non ego me jacto, sed quas Academia laudes.  
Attribuit vivo, mortuus ecce fruor.  
Et fruar, O lector; procul absit turba profana  
Æterno violans busta sacrata Deo.*

\* In “the Defence of the Answer to the Admonition,” page 24.  
*Ibid.* page 25.

† Whitgift,

John May, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Aldrich and Reuben Sherwood, Proctors; Miles Prance, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Doctors of Laws, 2; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 14; Masters of Arts, 55; Practitioner in Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Laws, 4; Bachelors of Arts, 114. A.D. 1569-70.

8, 9. *Whitgift's commencing Doctor. Whitgift summons Cartwright, who gives in a List of his Opinions.*

Amongst the Doctors of Divinity, John Whitgift, Master of Trinity College, took his degree, answering the Act, and publicly maintaining, in the Commencement-House, for his position, *Papa est ille anti-christus*.\*

John Whitgift, Vice-Chancellor; William Bingham and Hugo Bellot, Proctors; William Foxton, Mayor; Doctor of Laws, 1; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Masters of Arts, 71; Practitioner in Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Arts, 113. A.D. 1570-71.

Whitgift, now armed with authority as Vice-Chancellor, summoneth Cartwright to give an account of his opinions, which he neither denied nor dissembled, but under his own hand expressed in these words following:—

1. *Archiepiscoporum et archidiaconorum nomina, simul cum muneribus et officiis suis, sunt abolenda.*

2. *Legitimorum in ecclesiâ ministrorum nomina, qualia sunt episcoporum et diaconorum, separata a suis muneribus in verbo Dei descriptis simpliciter sunt improbanda, et ad institutionem apostolicam revocanda, ut episcopus in verbo et precibus, diaconus in pauperibus curandis versetur.*

3. *Episcoporum Cancellariis, aut archidiaconorum officialibus &c. regimen ecclesiæ non est committendum, sed ad idoneum ministrum et presbyterum ejusdem ecclesiæ deferendum.*

4. *Non oportet ministrum esse vagum et liberum, sed quisque debet certo cuidam gregi adjici.*

5. *Nemo debet ministerium tanquam candidatus petere.*

6. *Episcoporum tantum autoritate et potestate ministri non sunt creandi; multò minus in musæo aut loco quopiam clanculario; sed ab ecclesiâ electio fieri debet.*

*Hisce reformandis, quisque pro suâ vocatione studere debet, (vocationem autem intelligo,) ut magistratus autoritate, minister verbo, omnes precibus permoveant.*

And because he persisted resolute in the defence thereof, the Vice-Chancellor made use of his authority, and, March 18th, flatly deprived him of his lecture, and banished [him from] the University,

\* SIR GEORGE PAUL, in his "Life," page 5.

according to the tenor of the ensuing instrument registered in Cambridge:—

“Whereas it is reported, that Master Cartwright, offering disputations and conference, touching the assertions uttered by him and subscribed with his hand, and that he could not obtain his request therein: This is to testify, that, in the presence of us, whose names are here underwritten, and in our hearing, the said Mr. Cartwright was offered conference of divers; and namely, of Mr. Doctor Whitgift, who offered, that if the said Mr. Cartwright would set down his assertions in writing, and his reasons unto them, he would answer the same in writing also; the which Master Cartwright refused to do. Further, the said Doctor Whitgift, at such time as Mr. Cartwright was deprived of his lecture, did in our presence ask the said Mr. Cartwright, whether he had both publicly and privately divers times offered the same conference unto him by writing, or not; to which Mr. Cartwright answered, that he had been so offered, and that he refused the same. Moreover, the said Mr. Cartwright did never offer any disputation, but upon these conditions; namely, that he might know who should be his adversaries, and who should be his judges; meaning such judges as he himself could best like of. Neither was this kind of disputation denied unto him, but only he was required to obtain licence of the queen’s majesty, or the council, because his assertions be repugnant to the state of the commonwealth, which may not be called into question by public disputation without licence of the prince or his highness’s council.

“JOHN WHITGIFT, Vice-Chancellor,  
ANDREW PEARNE, JOHN MEY, EDWARD HAWFORD,  
WILLIAM CHADDERTON, HENRY HARVY, THOMAS F——,  
THOMAS B——.”

Thus was Mr. Cartwright totally routed in Cambridge, and, being forced to forsake the spring, betook himself to the stream; of whom largely in our “History of the Church.” \*

10—12. *Dr. Baker, Provost of King’s College, flies for Religion. Roger Goade chosen in his Place. [Number of Students in the University].*

Philip Baker, Doctor of Divinity, Provost of King’s College, being a zealous papist, had hitherto so concealed his religion that he was not only the first ecclesiastical person on whom queen Elizabeth bestowed

\* See vol. ii. pp. 503, 504; and vol. iii. pp. 68—70, 104—120, 125—128, 165, 166, and 171.—EDIT.

preferment, but also, being Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, commendably discharged the place without any discovery of his opinions. But now, being questioned for his religion, not willing to abide the trial, he fled beyond the seas. Even such who dislike his judgment will commend his integrity, that, having much of the College money and plate in his custody, (and more at his command, aiming to secure, not enrich, himself,) he faithfully resigned all; yea, carefully sent back the College horses which carried him to the seaside.

Roger Goade was chosen in his place, fetched from Guildford, in Surrey, where he was a schoolmaster; a pleasant sight to behold preferment seeking to find out desert. Forty years was he Provost of that House; in which time he met with much opposition, such as governors must expect, arising from the antipathy betwixt youth and severity. And no wonder, if young Scholars swelled against him, who bound them hard to the observation of the statutes. However, he always came off with credit, chiefly befriended with his own innocence.

Roger Kelke, Vice-Chancellor; Arthur Purifoy and John Beacon, Proctors; William Bright, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Doctor of Laws, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 8; Masters of Arts, 61; Bachelors of Arts, 185. A.D. 1571-72.

Thomas Bing, Vice-Chancellor; Walter Alleyn and John Tracy, Proctors; Oliver Flint, Mayor; Doctors of Laws, 2; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 8; Masters of Arts, 63; Bachelors of Laws, 7; Bachelors of Arts, 120. 1572-73.

John Whitgift, Vice-Chancellor; Richard Bridgwater and Lancelot Browne, Proctors; Christopher Flecher, Mayor; Doctors of Laws, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 9; Masters of Arts, 57; Bachelor of Laws, 1; Bachelor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Arts, 146. 1573-74.

Andrew Perne, Vice-Chancellor; John Cragge and Luke Gilpin, Proctors; Thomas Kymbold, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 6; Doctors of Laws, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 13; Masters of Arts, 104; Bachelors of Arts, 130. 1574-75.

Dr. Caius set forth his excellent History of Cambridge, and took an exact account of all the Students therein, amounting unto one thousand seven hundred eighty-three; and if any be so curious as to know how these numbers were divided betwixt the several Colleges, the ensuing catalogue will inform them:—

1. Peter House, 96. 2. Clare Hall, 129. 3. Pembroke Hall, 87. 4. Bene't College, 93. 5. Trinity Hall, 68. 6. Gonville and Caius College, 62. 7. King's College, 140. 8. Queen's College, 122. 9. Catherine Hall, 32. 10. Jesus College, 118.



11. Christ's College, 157. 12. St. John's College, 271. 13. Magdalen College, 49. 14. Trinity College, 359.

**John Smil** Vice-Chancellor: **Thomas Randall** and **David Yale**, **Proctors**: **Roger Sierr** **Mayer**: **Doctors** of Divinity, 3; **Doctors** of Law, 3: **Doctors** of Medicine, 4: **Bachelors** of Divinity, 16;  **Masters** of Arts, 79: **Bachelors** of Law, 2: **Bachelor** of Medicine, 1: **Bachelors** of Arts, 174. A. D. 1575-76.

12—13. *How far the rents of Colleges by the Procurement of Sir T. Smith. Great Profit thereby.*

This year an Act passed in Parliament most beneficial to both Universities whereby it was provided that a third part of the rent upon leases made by Colleges should be reserved in corn,\* paying after the rate of six shillings eight-pence the quarter (ten-pence a bushel for good wheat and five shillings a quarter, or under, seven-pence half-penny a bushel) for good malt, generally dearer than barley, the price of making it being cast into the price. This sort the leases were yearly to deliver to the Colleges, either in kind or in money, after the rate of the best wheat and malt, in the markets of Cambridge and Oxford at the days prefixed for the payment thereof.

**Sir Thomas Smith**, principal secretary of state, was the chief promoter of the passing of this Act, and is said by some to have surprised the house therein: where many could not conceive how this would be at all profitable to the College, but still the same on the point, whether they had it in money or wares. But the politic knight took the advantage of the present cheap year, knowing hereafter grain would grow dearer, mankind daily multiplying, and income being daily legally given for transportation. This is that **sir Thomas** born at **Walden**, in **Essex**, deserving as well to be called **SMITH WALDEN** as **SAFFRON WALDEN**, as no less eminent for this worthy statesman born therein, as for that sovereign agriculture growing thereabout.

At this day much emolument redoundeth to the ancient Colleges in each University, (foundation since the statute enjoying no benefit thereby.) by the passing of this Act; so that, though their rents stand still, their revenues do increase. True it is, when they have least corn, they have most bread, I mean, best maintenance,—the dividends then mounting the highest. I wish them good stomachs to their meat, digestion to their stomachs, strength and health on their digestion.

**Roger Grosse**, Vice-Chancellor; **Arthur Purifoy** and **Thomas**

\* See **PURTON'S** "Collections of the Statutes," 18 Elizabeth, cap. 6.

Patenson, Proctors; Miles Prawaite, Mayor; Doctors of Medicine, 5; Bachelors of Divinity, 18; Masters of Arts, 93; Practitioners in Surgery, 2; Bachelors of Arts, 160. A.D. 1576-77.

Richard Howland, Vice-Chancellor; Osmund Lakes and Nicholas Steer, Proctors; John Chase, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Doctors of Laws, 3; Bachelors of Divinity, 12; Masters of Arts, 85; Bachelors of Laws, 6; Bachelors of Arts, 115; Practitioners in Medicine, 3. 1578-79.

Thomas Bing, Vice-Chancellor; William Farrand and Richard Willowby, Proctors; Edward Wallis, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctors of Laws, 6; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 15; Masters of Arts, 106; Bachelors of Laws, 6; Bachelors of Arts, 153; Practitioner in Medicine, 1. 1578-79.

John Hatcher, Vice-Chancellor; William Lakin and John Bradley, Proctors; Marmaduke Bland, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Doctors of Laws, 3; Doctors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 17; Masters of Arts, 86; Bachelor of Laws, 1; Bachelors of Arts, 205; Practitioner in Medicine, 1. 1579-80.

Andrew Perne, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Nevill and John Duport, Proctors; William Foxton, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 4; Doctors of Laws, 7; Doctors of Medicine, 6; Bachelors of Divinity, 8; Masters of Arts, 61; Bachelors of Laws, 4; Bachelors of Arts, 194; Practitioners in Medicine, 2. 1580-81.

#### 16. *A Contest betwixt Dr. Baro and Mr. Chadderton.*

A contest happened between Mr. Chadderton (afterward Master of Emmanuel College) and Dr. Baro, Margaret-Professor, about some heterodox opinions, vented by the same Baro both in his readings and print, namely, in his Comment on Jonah, and book *De Fide*.

Whereupon, the Doctor procured Mr. Chadderton to be called into the Consistory, in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Hawford, Dr. Harvey, and Dr. Legge, where he utterly denied he had ever preached against the Doctor; but he propounded these questions as erroneous and false: 1. *Primus Dei amor non est in naturâ fidei justificantis.* 2. *Fides justificans non præcipitur in decalogo.*

Many papers in Latin passed betwixt them, and at last they were conceived to come nearer together in these their expressions; the originals being kept in the University-library:—

DE PRIMA, SIC PETRUS BARO.

DE PRIMA, MR. CHADDERTON  
*in hunc Modum.**Nullus amor est Deo gratus  
sine fide.**Quoddam desiderium justitiæ,  
et remissionis peccatorum obti-  
nendæ in fide justificante inest,  
non naturale, sed gratuitum,  
Spiritus Sancti donum.**Omnis amor ante fidem est peccatum.  
Sola fides apprehendit justificationem.*1. *In operatione justificationis  
Christianæ, nulla est cooperatio  
fidei et amoris.*2. *Omnis amor qui placet Deo  
est opus Spiritus Sancti super-  
naturale, et fructus fidei justifi-  
cantis, non pars.*

DE SECUNDA.

*Fides justificans decalogo præ-  
cipitur quatenus decalogo sumi-  
tur pro decem illis sententiis,  
quas Deus suo ore in monte  
Sinai pronuntiavit, quibus uni-  
versa pietas comprehenditur.**Fides justificans, decalogo alio  
modo sumpto nempe pro nudis  
legis mandatis, ac quatenus a  
Paulo Christo opponitur, non  
continetur.*

PETRUS BARO.

DE SECUNDA,

1. *Decalogo, secundum nota-  
tionem vocis, pro decem præceptis  
moralibus, fides justificans non  
præcipitur.*2. *Decalogo pro universâ lege  
Mosis sumpto, fides justificans  
præcipitur.*

LAURENCE CHADDERTON.

Now, however they might seem in terms to approach, their judgments were so far asunder that it set their affections at the same distance, so that no compliance betwixt them, and the Doctor at last outed of his place; whereof hereafter.

William Fulke, Vice-Chancellor; John Jegon and Robert Livelesse, Proctors; Oliver Flint, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 3; Bachelors of Divinity, 20; Masters of Arts, 102; Bachelors of Laws, 3; Bachelors of Arts, 213. A.D. 1581-82.

John Bell, Vice-Chancellor; Anthony Wingfield, Leonard Chamber, and Gabriel Harvie, Proctors; John Goldsborow, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 9; Doctors of Laws, 3; Bachelors of Divinity, 14; Masters of Arts, 129; Bachelors of Laws, 3; Bachelors of Arts, 213. 1582-83.

Richard Howland, Vice-Chancellor; Henry Hickman and Henry Hawkins, Proctors; Henry Clerk, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 9;

Masters of Arts, 113 ; Bachelor of Laws, 1 ; Bachelors of Arts, 236. 1583–84.

Robert Norgat, Vice-Chancellor ; William Hawes and Thomas Bradocke, Proctors ; Thomas Dormer, Mayor ; Doctors of Divinity, 2 ; Doctors of Laws, 2 ; Bachelors of Divinity, 13 ; Masters of Arts, 113 ; Bachelor of Medicine, 1 ; Bachelors of Arts, 192. 1584–85.

17—19. *Emmanuel College founded by Sir Walter Mildmay, who causelessly fell into the Queen's Displeasure. His Answer to Queen Elizabeth.*

Walter Mildmay, knight, fifth son of Thomas Mildmay, of Chelmsford, in Essex, formerly a serious Student in, and benefactor to, Christ's College, Chancellor of the Duchy, and of the Exchequer, founded a House by the name of Emmanuel College, in a place where the Dominicans, Black-Friars, or Preaching Friars, had formerly their convent, founded *anno* one thousand two hundred eighty, by the lady Alice countess of Oxford,\* daughter and sole heir of Gilbert lord Samford, hereditary lord Chamberlain of England.† After the suppression of monasteries, it was the dwelling-house of one Mr. Sherwood, from whom, as I take it, Sir Walter purchased the same.

Sir Robert Naunton, in his *Fragmenta Regalia*, did leave as well as take,—omitting some statesmen (of the first magnitude) no less valued by, than useful to, queen Elizabeth, as appears by his not mentioning of this worthy knight. True it is, toward the end of his days, he fell into this queen's disfavour, not by his own demerit, but the envy of his adversaries. For he, being employed, by virtue of his place, to advance the queen's treasure, did it industriously, faithfully, and conscionably, without wronging the subject, being very tender of their privileges ; insomuch that he once complained in parliament, that “ many subsidies were granted, and no grievances redressed : ” which words, being represented with his disadvantage to the queen, made her to disaffect him, setting in a Court cloud, but in the sunshine of his country and a clear conscience.

Coming to Court after he had founded his College, the queen told him, “ Sir Walter, I hear you have erected a puritan foundation.” “ No, madam,” saith he : “ far be it from me to countenance any thing contrary to your established laws ; but I have set an acorn, which, when it becomes an oak, God alone knows what will be the fruit thereof.” Sure I am, at this day it hath over-

\* *Sceletos Cantabrigiensis*, MS.

† This is subsequently corrected in the “ Appeal of Injured Innocence,” part 1, Introd. 3.—EDIT.

shadowed all the University,—more than a moiety of the present Masters of Colleges being bred therein. But let us behold their benefactors.

**MASTERS.**—1. Laurence Chadderton. 2. John Preston. 3. William Sandcroft. 4. Richard Oldesworth [Holdsworth]. 5. Anthony Tuckney. 6. William Dillingham.

**BISHOPS.**—1. Joseph Hall, bishop of Norwich. 2. William Bedell, bishop of Kilmore, in Ireland.

**BENEFACTORS.**—Queen Elizabeth. Henry earl of Huntingdon. Sir Francis Hastings. Sir Robert Jermyn. Sir Francis Walsingham. Sir Henry Killegrew. Sir Wolstan Dixy. Sir John Hart. Sir Samuel Leonard. Sir Thomas Skinner. Alexander Noel. Dr. Leeds. Dr. Harvey. Dr. Branthwait. Robert Tailor. Customer Smith. Nicholas Fuller. Roger Slegg. Francis Chamberlaine. Master Ellis. John Spenliffe. William Neale. Edmund English. Alderman Ratcliffe. John Morley. Richard Culverwell. Robert Johnson. John Bernes. Mary Dixy. Martha Jermyn. Alice Owen. Joyce Franckland. Elizabeth Walters. Dr. Richardson. Sir Henry Mildmay, of Graces. Richard Knightly. Thomas Hobbs. Walter Richards.

**LEARNED WRITERS, FELLOWS.**—William Jones. William Bedell. John Down. Hugh Cholmley. Joseph Hall. Ralph Cudworth. Samuel Crooke. John Cotton. Thomas Hooker. John Yates. John Stoughton.

**LEARNED WRITERS, NO FELLOWS.**—James Wadsworth, who turned papist. John Gifford, “Of Ministers’ Maintenance.” Ezekiel Culverwell, “Of Faith.” Robert Firman, “Of Admission to the Sacrament.” Samuel Foster, “Of Mathematics.” Jeremiah Burrowes; besides many still surviving. Sir Roger Twysden, an excellent antiquary. H. Laurence, “Of Angels,” and other treatises. Stephen Marshall. Thomas Shephard. Samuel Hudson, “Of the visible Church.” Nathanael Ward. Thomas Arthur. Thomas Doughty. John Wallis is now Geometry-Professor in Oxford.

**COLLEGE-LIVINGS.**—Auler [Aller] rectory, in the diocess of Bath and Wells, valued at £39. 14s. 10d. Cadbury rectory, in the diocess of Bath and Wells, valued at £28. 17s. 2½d. Pydleton [Piddletown] vicarage, in the diocess of Bristol, valued at £31. 2s. 10d. Stanground vicarage, in the diocess of Lincoln, valued at £6. 6s. 10d. Winnsford vicarage, in the diocess of Bath and Wells, valued at £14. 13s. 8d. Loughborough rectory, in the diocess of Lincoln, valued at £40. 16s. 3d.

So that lately (namely, *anno* 1634) were maintained one Master, *fourteen Fellows*, fifty Scholars, ten poor Scholars, besides Officers

and Servants of the foundation, with other Students; the whole number being three hundred and ten.

20—23. *Dr. Holdsworth refuseth a Bishopric. A good Meditation of a dying Saint. Two grand Benefactors. The Living omitted.*

Amongst the bishops of this House, Richard Holdsworth, fourth Master, must not be forgotten, who might, but would not, be bishop of Bristol: not out of covetousness, (from which none more free,) because so small the revenues thereof; or laziness to decline pains, none being more laborious in his calling; or scruple of conscience, none more zealous in a certain episcopacy; but for some secret reasons, which these troublesome times suggested unto him. He was a most excellent preacher, both by his pious life and patient death; and one passage which I heard from him, some days before his expiring, I shall here insert:—

“I admire,” said he, “at David’s gracious heart, who so often in Scripture (but especially in the 119th Psalm) extolleth the worth and value of the word of God; and yet *quantillum Scripturæ*, how little of the word of God they had in that age,—the Pentateuch, the Book of Job, and some of the Hagiography! How much have we now thereof since the accession of the Prophets, but especially of the New Testament! And yet, alas! the more we have of the word of God, the less it is generally regarded.”

Amongst the benefactors of this House, I have omitted two, not because too small, but too great, to be inserted with others, deserving a form by themselves; namely, the lady Grace Mildmay, whom the Scholars of this College account the fourth Grace, and more worth than the other three, as poetical fictions. The other, Francis Ash, esquire, a rich merchant of London, to whom God hath given a full hand, and free heart, to be bountiful on all good occasions.

Amongst the learned writers of this College, I have omitted many still alive; as Mr. Anthony Burges, the profitable expounder of the much-mistaken nature of the two covenants; Dr. Benjamin Whichcot, now Provost of King’s, whose perfect list cannot be given in, because daily increasing.

Humphrey Tindall, Vice-Chancellor; Joseph Smith and John Cowell, Proctors; John Edmonds, Mayor; Doctor of Divinity, 1; Doctors of Laws, 3; Doctors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 16; Masters of Arts, 165; Bachelors of Laws, 3; Bachelors of Arts, 198. A. D. 1585–86.

24. *The last Vice-Chancellor then, but Fellow of the House.*

John Capcott, Vice-Chancellor; Anthony Wingfield and Henry Farr, Proctors; John Edmonds, Mayor; Doctor of Laws, 1; Doctors of Medicine, 2; Bachelors of Divinity, 16; Masters of Arts, 185; Bachelors of Arts, 180. A.D. 1586—87.

Dr. Capcott, when chosen Vice-Chancellor, was only Fellow of Trinity College; within which he gave upper-hand to Dr. Still, then Master, but took it of him when out of the walls of the College. But before the year ended, he was chosen Master of Bene't College, and an Act made amongst the Doctors, that, "for the time to come, none but Heads of Houses should be chosen Vice-Chancellors."

Thomas Legge, Vice-Chancellor; John Palmer and John Smith, Proctors, Roger Smith, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 2; Doctor of Laws, 1; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 8; Masters of Arts, 121; Bachelors of Laws, 2; Bachelors of Arts, 129. A.D. 1587—88.

Thomas Nevill, Vice-Chancellor; Robert Canesfeild and Miles Sandys, Proctors; Nicholas Gaunt, Mayor; Doctors of Divinity, 7; Doctors of Laws, 3; Doctor of Medicine, 1; Bachelors of Divinity, 19; Masters of Arts, 107; Bachelors of Laws, 3; Bachelors of Arts, 182. 1588—89.

25. *An unfaithful Register.*

Hitherto we have given in the list of the yearly Commencers, but now must break off; let Thomas Smith, University-Register, bear the blame, who, about this year entering into his office, was so negligent, that, as one saith, *Cum fuit Academiæ a memoriâ, omnia tradidit oblivioni*, I can hardly inhold from inveighing on his memory, carelessness being dishonesty in public persons so intrusted.

Thomas Preston, Vice-Chancellor; Henry Mountlaw and Richard Betts, Proctors; William Wolfe, Mayor. A.D. 1589—90.

Robert Soame, Vice-Chancellor; John Sledd and Cuthbert Bambrugge, Proctors; John Clerke, Mayor. 1590—91.

Robert Soame, Vice-Chancellor; Gilbert Jacob and Otho Hill; Proctors; Thomas Goldsborow, Mayor. 1591—92.

John Still and Thomas Legge, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Grimston and Samuel Harsnett, Proctors; Thomas Medcalfe, Mayor. 1592—93.

John Duport, Vice-Chancellor; Henry Mountlow, and Thomas Jegon, Proctors; Christopher Hodson, Mayor. 1593—94.

John Duport, Vice-Chancellor; Gregory Milner and John Meriton, Proctors; Oliver Greene, Mayor. 1594—95.



Roger Goade, Vice-Chancellor; Lionel Duckett and Thomas Cooke, Proctors; John Norcott, Mayor. 1594-95.

*26, 27. Barrett summoned before the Consistory. His solemn Recantation.*

William Barrett, Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, preached *ad Clerum*, April 29th, for his degree of Bachelor in Divinity, in St. Mary's, wherein he vented such doctrines, for which he was summoned, May 5th, six days after, before the consistory of the Doctors, and there enjoined the following recantation:—

“PREACHING in Latin not long since, in the University-church, (right worshipful,) many things slipped from me, both falsely and rashly spoken, whereby, I understand, the minds of many have been grieved: to the end therefore that I may satisfy the church and the truth, which I have publicly hurt, I do make this public confession, both repeating and revoking my errors.

“First. I said, that no man in this transitory world is so strongly underpropped, at least by the certainty of faith,—that is, unless (as I afterwards expounded it) by revelation,—that he ought to be assured of his own salvation. But now I protest before God, and acknowledge in my own conscience, that they which are justified by faith have peace towards God, that is, have reconciliation with God, and do stand in that grace by faith: therefore that they ought to be certain and assured of their own salvation, even by the certainty of faith itself.

“Secondly. I affirmed, that the faith of Peter could not fail, but that other men's may: for, as I then said, our Lord prayed not for the faith of every particular man. But now, being of a better and more sound judgment, (according to that which Christ teacheth in plain words, John xvii. 20: ‘I pray not for these alone,’ that is, the apostles, ‘but for them also which shall believe in me through their word,’) I acknowledge, that Christ did pray for the faith of every particular believer; and that, by the virtue of that prayer of Christ, every true believer is so stayed up, that his faith cannot fail.

“Thirdly. Touching perseverance unto the end, I said, that that certainty concerning the time to come is proud, forasmuch as it is, in his own nature, contingent, of what kind the perseverance of every man is: neither did I affirm it to be proud only, but to be most wicked. But now I freely protest, that the true and justifying faith (whereby the faithful are most nearly united unto Christ) is so firm, as also for the time so certain, that it can never be rooted out of the minds of the faithful, by any tentations of the flesh, the world, or the devil himself; so that he who hath his

faith once, shall ever have it. For, by the benefit of that justifying faith, Christ dwelleth in us, and we in Christ : therefore it cannot be but increased, (Christ growing in us daily,) as also persevere unto the end, because God doth give constancy.

“Fourthly. I affirmed, that there was no distinction in faith, but in the persons believing. In which, I confess, I did err. Now I freely acknowledge, that temporary faith (which, as Bernard witnesseth, is therefore feigned, because it is temporary) is distinguished and differeth from that saving faith whereby sinners, apprehending Christ, are justified before God for ever ; not in measure and degrees, but in the very thing itself. Moreover, I add, that James doth make mention of a dead faith ; and Paul, of a faith that worketh by love.

“Fifthly. I added, that forgiveness of sins is an article of faith, but not particular, neither belonging to this man nor to that man : that is, (as I expounded it,) that no true, faithful man either can or ought certainly to believe that his sins are forgiven. But now I am of another mind, and do freely confess, that every true, faithful man is bound, by this article of faith, (to wit, ‘I believe the forgiveness of sins,’) certainly to believe that his own particular sins are freely forgiven him : neither doth it follow hereupon, that that petition of the Lord’s Prayer (to wit, ‘Forgive us our trespasses’) is needless ; for, in that petition, we ask not only the gift, but also the increase, of faith.

“Sixthly. These words escaped me in my sermon, namely : ‘As for those that are not saved, I do most strongly believe, and do freely protest, that I am so persuaded, against Calvin, Peter Martyr, and the rest, that sin is the true, proper, and first cause of reprobation.’ But now, being better instructed, I say, that the reprobation of the wicked is from everlasting, and that the saying of Augustine to Simplician is most true, namely : ‘If sin were the cause of reprobation, then no man should be elected, because God doth foreknow all men to be defiled with it ; and (that I may speak freely) I am of the same mind, and do believe, concerning the doctrine of election and reprobation, as the church of England believeth and teacheth in the Book of the Articles of Faith, in the Article of Predestination.

“Last of all. I uttered these words rashly against Calvin, a man that hath very well deserved of the church of God ; to wit, that ‘he durst presume to lift up himself above the high and almighty God.’ By which words I confess, that I have done great injury to that most learned and right godly man ; and I do most humbly beseech you all to pardon this my rashness. As also, that *I have uttered many bitter words against Peter Martyr, Theodore*

**Besa**, Jerome Zanchius, Francis Junius, and the rest of the same religion, being the lights and ornaments of our church; calling them by the odious names of 'Calvinists,' and other slanderous terms, branding them with a most grievous mark of reproach, whom because our church doth worthily reverence, it was not meet that I should take away their good name from them, or any way impair their credit, or dehort others of our countrymen from reading their most learned works. I am therefore very sorry, and grieved for this most grievous offence which I have publicly given to this most famous University, which is the temple of true religion, and sacred receptacle of piety. And I do promise you, that, by God's help, I will never hereafter offend in like sort; and I do earnestly beseech you, right worshipful, and all others to whom I have given this offence, either in the former articles, or in any part of my said sermon, that you would of your courtesy pardon me, upon this my repentance."

This recantation was by the Doctors peremptorily enjoined him; that on Saturday following, May 10th, immediately after the *Clerum*, he should go up into the pulpit of St. Mary's, (where he had published these errors,) and there, openly in the face of the University, read, and make this recantation: which by him was done accordingly; but not with that remorse and humility as was expected; for, after the reading thereof, he concluded thus, *Hæc dixi*, as if all had been oral rather than cordial. Yea, soon after he departed the University, got beyond sea, turned a papist, returned into England, where he led a layman's life until the day of his death.

John. Jegon, Vice-Chancellor; Ezekiel Hilliard and William Bolton, Proctors; Robert Wallis, Mayor. A.D. 1595-96.

28—30. *The Sickness and Death of Dr. Whitaker. His sad and solemn Funeral. Overall succeeds him in the Professor's Place.*

Dr. Whitaker, returning from Lambeth conference, November 28th, brought home with him the bane of his health, contracted there by hard and late studying, and watching, in a very cold winter. In his journey homewards, he was rather not well than sick; and when come to St. John's College, the outside of his disease (so much as appeared in the symptoms thereof) had little of danger, whilst the inside thereof (as the sad success declared) had nothing of hope therein. On the Sunday following, November 30th, he took his bed, and then was there no want of physicians, if not too much plenty of them about him. They meet, consult, conclude he must be let blood; but none did what all advised

should be done. This was deferred till Wednesday next, December 3rd ; (let the blame thereof, to make it the lighter, be divided amongst all his friends there ;) and then, when all things else were fitted for blood-letting, the patient himself was unfit, being in so violent a sweat, that opening of a vein would, as all thought, let out blood and life together. That night he cheerfully received in himself the sentence of death, professing that he desired not life, but to glorify God, and serve the church therewith, though his wife was near the time of her travail, whose *posthume* child he bequeathed to God, the chief father thereof. Next day, being Thursday, December 4th, he quietly resigned his soul to God, in the forty-seventh year of his life ; one so exactly qualified, that the Professor's Chair may seem made for him, and he for it, they mutually so fitted each other. . .

December 10th, six days after, his funerals were solemnly performed after this manner : all the University repaired to St. John's College, which they found hung (Chapel, Hall, and outward Court) with mourning, scutcheons, and verses. Then, taking up the corpse, they all advance, in their academical equipage, to St. Mary's, where the mayor and aldermen (whose vicinity to the University commonly causeth their distance from it) met them in their mourning formalities. Then Dr. Goade, the Vice-Chancellor, pathetically preached to the auditory. His tears were so mannerly, (or religious rather,) that, observing their time, they obstructed not his sermon till come to a competent length, when the spring-tide of his weeping stopped his preaching. Thus his sermon (like *his* life who was the subject of it, cut off when not much passed the prime thereof) was rather broken off than ended. So sad was the whole congregation, that one might as soon therein have found a face without eyes, as eyes without tears. Back they all return to the College, where, after a Latin oration made by one of the Fellows, his corpse was solemnly interred in the chapel. Then a banquet of sweetmeats, soured with so sad an occasion, (at the sole charge of the College,) was rather seen than tasted by the guests, formerly surfeited with sorrow. Hence they re-advance to St. Mary's, where Robert Naunton, University-Orator, (after knighted, and secretary of state,) with another Latin speech concluded the funeral solemnity.

Soon after, two candidates appeared for the Professor's place, John Overall, of Trinity, Doctor—Anthony Wotton, of King's College, Bachelor—of Divinity. Both read solemn lectures of probation on subjects assigned them ; namely, Overall, on Hebrews vi. 4, &c. “ For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, *and have tasted* the heavenly gift,—if they shall fall away, to renew

them again unto repentance." Wotton, on James ii. 24: "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

Pity it is but the place should have been capable of both,—both approving themselves so deserving of it. Wherefore Wotton was not rejected, though Overall was preferred to the Chair. Yea, rather than Wotton's worth should pass unrewarded, a Professor's place of Divinity (though not in Cambridge) shall either be found out, or founded for him. For, within few months after, he was made the first Reader of Divinity in Gresham's College, in London.\*

31, 32. *Dr. Baro quits his Professor's Place. Different Judgments about his Departure.*

The end of Dr. Peter Baro's (the Margaret Professor's) triennial lectures began to draw near. Now, although custom had made such courtesy almost a due to continue the same Professor where no urgent reasons to the contrary were alleged; yet the University intended not to re-elect him for the place, meaning fairly to cut him off at the just joint, (which would be the less pain and shame unto him,) when his three years should be expired. He himself was sensible thereof; and, besides, he saw the Articles of Lambeth, (whereof largely before,†) lately sent to the University, and foresaw that subscription thereunto would be expected from—yea, imposed on—him, to which he could not condescend: and therefore resolved to quit his place. So that this his departure was not his free act, out of voluntary election, but that whereunto his will was necessarily determined: witness his own return to a friend, requiring of him the cause of his withdrawing: *Fugio*, saith he, *ne fugarer*, "I fly, for fear to be driven away."‡

Some conceive this hard measure, which was used to one of Dr. Baro's qualifications. For, First, *he was a foreigner*, a Frenchman: *Turpius ejicitur, quàm non admittitur, hospes*. Secondly. *A great scholar*; for, he who denieth learning in Baro, (so witnessed in his works,) plainly affirmeth no scholarship in himself. Thirdly. *An inoffensive man* for life and conversation; seeing nothing of viciousness could be charged upon him, which, otherwise,

\* Stow's "Survey of London," page 65.  
anno 1595, vol. iii. pp. 147—150.

† See our "Church History,"  
‡ On the subject of Barrett and Baro, the reader will obtain correct information in Strype's "Life of Archbishop Whitgift:" in the Appendix to which he will also find the information which Fuller (in his "Church History," vol. iii. p. 149) promised to cite at large, this year, in a note to his "History of Cambridge," but which, like many of his other good purposes, seems to have been forgotten.—EDIT.

in his contest with Mr. Chaderton,\* had been urged against him. Lastly. *An aged man*, coming hither many years since, (when the Professor's place as much needed him as he it,) and who had painfully spent his strength in the employment. Others alleged, that in such cases of conscience there lies no plea for courtesy; and that Baro, as he was *a stranger*, had brought in *strange* doctrines, to the infecting of the University, the fountain of learning and religion; and therefore archbishop Whitgift designed the removing of him from his place. Thomas Playfere, Fellow of St. John's, in Cambridge, and Doctor of Divinity, was elected to succeed him in his Professor's place; of whom largely hereafter.

33—35. *The first Foundation of Sidney-Sussex College. The Spite of Index Expurgatorius. The College-Mortmain how procured.*

On the twentieth day of May was the first stone laid of Sidney College, (the whole fabric whereof was finished three years after,) on the cost of the lady Frances Sidney, daughter to sir William, sister to sir Henry, (lord deputy of Ireland,) aunt to sir Philip Sidney, relict of Thomas Ratcliffe, the third earl of Sussex. This lady died seven years since, on the ninth of March, 1588, as appears by the epitaph on her monument, in Westminster Abbey, in which church she founded a salary of twenty pounds a-year, for a Divinity-Lecture. By her will, dated December 6th, 1588, she left to her executors, Henry Gray, earl of Kent, and to her nephew sir John (afterwards lord) Harrington, five thousand pounds, besides her goods unbequeathed, for the erection of a College, and purchasing of competent lands, for one Master, ten Fellows, and twenty Scholars. But, in case the legacy would not thereunto extend, then the same to go to the enlarging of Clare Hall, for the maintenance of so many Fellows and Scholars therein, to enjoy all liberties, customs, and privileges, with other Fellows and Scholars of that foundation. She appointed John Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, and Gabriel Goodman, dean of Westminster, overseers of her will; ordering also, that Alexander Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, should preach her funeral sermon, which (no doubt) was done accordingly.

Be it remembered, by the way, that the lately-mentioned earl of Kent is he on whom Mr. Camden bestows this deserved commendation: *Veræ nobilitatis ornamentis vir longè honoratissimus.*† But the *Index Expurgatorius*, set forth at Madrid, by Lewis Sanchez,

\* See our "University History," anno 1581, page 203.  
*nia, in the conclusion of Kent.*

† CAMDEN'S *Britan-*

the king's printer, 1612, (and truly reprinted at Geneva, 1619,) dashes these word with a *dele*, though the character given this peer, most honourable for his parentage, and no less for his piety,\* will justly remain to his memory when this peevish, partial Index shall be purged to nothing.

These two noble executors, in pursuance of the will of this testatrix, according to her desire and direction therein, in her name presented queen Elizabeth a jewel, being like a star, of rubies and diamonds, with a ruby in the midst thereof, worth an hundred and forty pounds, having on the back side a hand delivering up a heart unto a crown.† At the delivery hereof, they humbly requested of her highness a mortmain to found a College, which she graciously granted unto them. Their next care was to purchase of Trinity College a parcel of ground, with some ancient buildings thereon, (formerly called the Franciscans or Gray Friars,) procuring the same to be passed unto them in fee-farm by Act of Parliament, and thereon they laid the foundation of this new College.

36. *A little Babe (thank God and good Nurses!) well batetled.*

We usually observe infants born in the seventh month, though poor and pitiful creatures, are vital; and, with great care and good attendance, in time prove proper persons. Ovid, or his elder brother, (the words being dubiously placed,) may be an instance hereof:—

*Qui tribus ante quater mensibus ortus erat.‡*

To such a *partus septimestris* may Sidney College well be resembled, so low, lean, and little at the birth thereof. Alas! what is five thousand pounds to buy the site, build and endow a College therewith? As for her unbequeathed goods, they answered not expectation; and I have heard, that some inferior persons, employed in the sale of her jewels, were (out of their own want of skill, or of honesty in others) much deceived therein: yet such was the worthy care of her honourable executors, that this Benjamin-College—the least, and last in time, and born *after* (as he *at*) the death of its mother—thrived in a short time to a competent strength and stature.

MASTERS.—1. James Montague, first Master of this House, and a worthy benefactor thereof, giving much, procuring more, thereunto. 2. Francis Aldridge, Fellow of Trinity College, chosen 1608. 3. Samuel Ward, Fellow of Emmanuel College,

\* *Primæ classe, literæ G. Tristibus, lib. iv. eleg. 10.*

† Copied out of the words of her will.

‡ *De*



chosen 1609; of whom largely hereafter. 4. Richard Minshall, first Master,\* bred in and chosen by the College, and much meriting thereof by his providence.

BISHOPS.—James Montague, bishop of Bath and Wells, ~~anno~~ 1608, afterwards bishop of Winchester. John Bramhall, bishop of Londonderry, in Ireland.

BENEFACTORS.—Henry earl of Kent, who let the legacy of one hundred pounds (bequeathed him by the foundress) go on to the building of the College, though generally omitted in the catalogue of their benefactors. Sir John Hart, knight. Leonard Smith, citizen of London. Peter Blundel, of Tiverton, clothier.—John Freestone, esq. Edward lord Montague, of Boughton.—John lord Harrington, the younger; lady Lucy, his sister, countess of Bedford; lady Anne Harrington, their mother. George lord Goringe. John Young, D.D. dean of Winchester. Sir William Wilmore, first pensioner in the College. Robert Johnson, archdeacon of Leicester. John Harrington, esq. Godfrey Fuljambe, esq. Edward Wray, esq. Robert Hadson, esq. Francis Combe, esq. Paul Micletwait, D.D. and Fellow of the College. Richard Dugard.

LEARNED WRITERS.—1. Daniel Dike, that faithful servant, in discovering the deceitfulness of man's heart. 2. Jeremiah Dike, his brother. 3. Samuel Ward, minister of Ipswich. 4. Thomas Gatacre, much known by his book of "Lots," and other works. 5. Jeremiah Witaker. 6. Thomas Adams, a noted preacher in London.

LIVINGS.—*Sunt mihi non potis est dicere, dicit erunt.*†

37—40. *Sir Francis Clark deservedly accounted a By-Founder. To whom Sir John Brereton not much inferior. A Chapel added after some Years. A Child's Prayer for his Mother.*

As for the bounty of sir Francis Clark, it exceeded the bounds of benefaction, and justly entitled him to be a by-founder. The giver doubled the gift, if we consider, First. His estate was not great for one of his condition. Secondly. He had a daughter; and generally it is observed, that parents are most barren, and the childless most fruitful, in great expressions of charity. Thirdly. He was altogether unknown to the College, and the College to him; surprising it on a sudden with his bounty, so much the more welcome, because not expected. Yet such his liberality, that he not only built a fair and firm range of twenty chambers, (from the

\* The three former were put in by the foundress's executors. informed, one, once a servant of bishop Montague, hath given them one in Bedfordshire.

† I am since

addition whereof, a second court resulteth to the College,) but also augmented the Scholarships of the foundation, and founded four Fellowships and eight Scholarships more. Herein his favour justly reflected on his countrymen of Bedfordshire, preferring them before others to places of his own foundation.

Nor comes the bounty of sir John Brereton much behind him. He was (as I may term him) one of the aborigines of the College, one of the first Scholars of the House; and afterwards became his majesty's serjeant for the kingdom of Ireland. At his death he was not unmindful of this his mother, to whom he bequeathed a large legacy, above two thousand pounds. Now, whereas some benefactors in repute are malefactors in effect, (giving to Colleges δόρα ἄδωρα,) namely, such as burden and clog their donations to maintain more than they are able, (whereby their gifts become suckers, impairing the root of the foundation,) sir John's gift was so left at large for the disposal thereof, that it became a gift indeed, and really advanced the good of the College.

. This College continued without a chapel some years after the first founding thereof, until at last some good men's charity supplied this defect. Some have falsely reported, that the now-chapel of the College was formerly a stable; whereas indeed it was the Franciscans' ancient dormitory, as appeareth by the concavities still extant in the walls, places for their several repose. But others have complained, that it was never ceremoniously consecrated, which they conceive essential thereunto, whilst there want not their equals in learning and religion who dare defend, that the continued series of divine duties, (praying, preaching, administering the sacrament,) publicly practised for more than thirty years, (without the least check or control of those in authority,) in a place set apart to that purpose, doth sufficiently consecrate the same.

It is as yet but early days with this College, which hath not seen sixty years; yet hath it been fruitful in worthy men proportionably to the age thereof, and I hope it will daily increase. Now, though it be only the place of the parents, and proper to him (as the greater) to bless his child, Heb. vii. 6, yet it is the duty of the child to pray for his parents; in which relation my best desires are due to this Foundation, my mother for my last eight years in this University. May her lamp never lack light for the oil, or oil for the light thereof! "Zoar, is it not a little one?" Yet who shall despise the day of small things? May the foot of sacrilege, if once offering to enter the gates thereof, stumble, and rise no more! The Lord bless the labours of all the Students therein, that they may tend and end at his glory, their own salvation, the profit and honour of the church and commonwealth!

John Jegon, Vice-Chancellor; William Moon and Richard Sutton, Proctors; Robert Wallis, Mayor. A.D. 1596-97.

John Jegon, Vice-Chancellor; Nathanael Cole and William Rich, Proctors; James Robson, Mayor. 1597-98.

41—43. *Club-Law acted in Clare-Hall. Complained of by the Townsmen to the Council-Table. How declined.*

The young Scholars, conceiving themselves somewhat wronged by the townsmen, (the particulars whereof I know not,) betook them for revenge to their wits, as the weapon wherein lay their best advantage. These, having gotten a discovery of some town-privacies from Miles Goldsborough, one of their own corporation, composed a merry (but abusive) comedy, (which they called "Club-Law,") in English, as calculated for the capacities of such, whom they intended spectators thereof. Clare Hall was the place wherein it was acted; and the mayor, with his brethren, and their wives, were invited to behold it, or rather themselves abused therein. A convenient place was assigned to the townsfolk, (riveted in with Scholars on all sides,) where they might see and be seen. Here they did behold themselves in their own best clothes, (which the Scholars had borrowed,) so livelily personated, their habits, gestures, language, lieger-jests, and expressions, that it was hard to decide which was the true townsman, whether he that sat by, or he who acted on the stage. Sit still they could not for chafing, go out they could not for crowding, but, impatiently patient, were fain to attend till dismissed at the end of the comedy.

The mayor and his brethren soon after complain of this libellous play to the lords of the Privy Council, and truly aggravate the Scholars' offence, as if the mayor's mace could not be played with but that the sceptre itself is touched therein. Now, though such the gravity of the lords, as they must maintain magistracy, and not behold it abused; yet such their goodness, they would not with too much severity punish wit, though waggishly employed; and therefore only sent some slight and private check to the principal actors therein.

There goeth a tradition, many earnestly engaging for the truth thereof, that the townsmen, not contented herewith, importunately pressed, that some more severe and public punishment might be inflicted upon them. Hereupon, the lords promised in short time to come to Cambridge; and, because the life in such things is lacking when only *read*, they themselves would *see* the same comedy, with all the properties thereof, acted over again, (the

townsmen, as formerly, being enjoined to be present thereat,) that so they might the better proportion the punishment to the fault, if any appeared. But rather than the townsmen would be witnesses again to their own abusing, (wherein many things were too far from and some things too near to—truth,) they fairly fell off from any farther prosecution of the matter.

 45. *Robert Earl of Essex made Chancellor. Sir Robert Cecil chosen Chancellor.*

Upon the death of William Cecil, lord Burghley, Robert Devereux, earl of Essex, was chosen Chancellor of the University. Coming to Cambridge, he was entertained in Queen's College, where the room he lodged in is called "Essex chamber" to this day, and where the pleasant comedy of "Lelia" was excellently acted before him.

Robert Soame, Vice-Chancellor; William Boise and Randal Woodcock, Proctors; John Yaxley, Mayor. A.D. 1598–99.

John Jegon, Vice-Chancellor; John Goslin and George Mountain, Proctors; Jeremy Chase, Mayor. 1599–1600.

John Duport, Vice-Chancellor; Robert Naunton and Thomas Morison, Proctors; John Jenkinson, Mayor. 1600–1.

Sir Robert Cecil, principal secretary of state, was chosen Chancellor of the University, and did greatly befriend it on all occasions. He was afterward earl of Salisbury, and lord treasurer of England

William Smith, Vice-Chancellor; Richard Trim and John Forthenho, *Collegii Trinitatis*, Proctors; Edward Potto, Mayor. A.D. 1601–2.

John Cowell, Vice-Chancellor; Nathanael Wiburn and Edward Barwell, *Collegii Christi*, Proctors; Henry Jackson, Mayor. 1602–3.

46, 47. *King James's matchless Entertainment at Hinchinbrook; where the Doctors of Cambridge wait on His Majesty.*  
1 James.

King James removed by many small journeys and great feasting from Scotland to London. Always the last place he lodged in seemed so complete for entertainment, that nothing could be added thereunto; and yet commonly the next stage exceeded it in some stately accession; until at last, April 27th, his majesty came to Hinchinbrook, nigh Huntingdon, the house of Master Oliver Cromwell, where such his reception, that, in a manner, it made all former entertainments forgotten, and all future to despair to do the like.

All the pipes about the house expressed themselves in no other language than the several sorts of the choicest wines. The entertainer being so rich a subject, and the entertained so renowned a sovereign, altered the nature of what here was expended, (otherwise justly censurable for prodigality,) to be deservedly commended for true magnificence.

But it was the banquet which made the feast so complete. Hither came the Heads of the University of Cambridge, in their scarlet gowns and corner caps, where Mr. Robert Naunton, the Orator, made a learned Latin oration, wherewith his majesty was highly affected. The very variety of Latin was welcome to his ears, formerly almost surfeited with so many long English speeches, made to him as he passed every corporation. The Heads in general requested a confirmation of their privileges, (otherwise uncourtlike at this present to petition for particulars,) which his highness most willingly granted. Here one might have seen the king (passing over all other Doctors for his seniors) apply himself much in his discourse to Dr. Montague, Master of Sidney College. This was much observed by the courtiers, (who can see the beams of royal favour shining in at a small cranny,) interpreting it a token of his great and speedy preferment, as indeed it came to pass.

#### 48. *The Death of Mr. Perkins.*

Within the compass of this last year (but in the reign of queen Elizabeth) died that worthy and painful servant of Jesus Christ, Mr. William Perkins, whose Life I have formerly written,\* and, therefore, forbear any repetition. He was buried in his own parish church of St. Andrew's, in Cambridge. Only I will add, it sadded me lately to see that church wherein this Saint was interred ready to fall to the ground. Jacob said of Bethel, the house of God, "How dreadful is this place!" (Gen. xxviii. 17.) I am sorry it may, in a far different sense, be said of this St. Andrew's filling such as approach to it with fear of the ruins thereof. I say no more, but as David was glad *to go up* to the house of the Lord, all good men may be sorrowful to behold God's ruinous house *coming down* to them.

John Cowell, Vice-Chancellor; John Andrews, Mayor. A.D. 1603-4.

Richard Claton, Vice-Chancellor; John Edmonds and Robert Wallis, Mayors. 1604-5.

\* In my "Holy State."

**49—51.** *Recusants' Presentations given to the Universities. The Statute, how frequently frustrated by Recusants. Burgesses granted the Universities.*

It was enacted in parliament, that the Chancellor and Scholars of the University of Cambridge shall have the presentation, nomination, collation, and donation of and to every such benefice, prebend, or ecclesiastical living, school, hospital, and donative as shall happen to be void during such time as the patron thereof shall be and remain a recusant convict in the counties of Essex, Hertford, Bedford, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Suffolk, Norfolk, Rutland, Leicester, Lincoln, Derby, Nottingham, Shropshire, Cheshire, Lancaster, York, bishopric of Duresme, Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, Radnor, Denbigh, Flint, Carnarvon, Merioneth, Glamorgan, Anglesey.

The other moiety of counties was bestowed on Oxford. In this division, the greater half of the land fell to the share of Cambridge, whether we reckon the number of shires, being more, or measure the extent of ground, being greater, or consider, (the main matter herein,) that recusant-patrons were most numerous in the northern parts of the kingdom.

However, I have heard it oft complained of, that this statute took not effect according to the true intent thereof; either because many bishops were very backward in giving institutions on the presentations of the University, wherein we are willing to believe the fault not in them, but their officers; or because it is so hard a thing to prove or convict the legal conviction of a papist; or recusant-patrons, before their conviction, had such sleights, by pre-conveyances to make over their advowsons to others. Hence it was, that many clerks, presented by the University, were wearied out with vexatious suits, (overpoised with the weight of popish patrons' purses,) and forced at last either totally to relinquish their title, or to make a hard (not to say sometimes an unworthy) composition.

About this time also it was that the two Universities were honoured by the king, to have their respective burgesses to represent them in parliament.

Samuel Harsnet, Vice-Chancellor; Miles Raven and Edward Sent, Proctors; John Edmonds, Mayor. A.D. 1605—6.

**52.** *The Death and high Epitaph of Dr. Playfere.*

Roger Goade, Vice-Chancellor; William Barton and Samuel Tindal, Proctors; William Arthur, Mayor. A.D. 1606—7.

Thomas Playfere, D.D. Fellow of St. John's College, and

Margaret Professor, died this year, and was buried in the chancel of St. Buttolf's [Botolph's] church, where this is part of his epitaph:—

*Minister ille Triados, enthei logii  
Oraculum, patronus artium, parens  
Scientiarum, concionum rex, sacræ  
Cathedræ imperator, fulmen et tonitru scholæ,  
Suadæ maritus, ac gemellus ingenî,  
Ardor eorum, et exteræ gentis stupor, &c.*

Should this epitaph come under the hands of those Grecian officers deputed to proportion men's monuments to their merits, it is suspicious, they would make bold to pare part thereof; though indeed the Doctor was one of excellent parts, and a great commander of the Latin tongue. Dr. John Davenant succeeded in the Professor's place.

Robert Soame and Thomas Jegon, Vice-Chancellors; George Dearing and Thomas Cecil, Proctors; Jeremy Chase, Mayor. A. D. 1607-8.\*

John Duport, Vice-Chancellor; Richard Bridges and Anthony Disborough, Proctors; Thomas French, Mayor. 1608-9.

Fogg Newton, Vice-Chancellor; Abraham Bidle and Leonard Maw, Proctors; Thomas French, Mayor. 1609-10.

53—55. *Master Amese troubled about his Sermon in St. Mary's, against all playing at Cards and Dice. He leaveth the College.*

Barnabas Gouge, Vice-Chancellor; John Aungier and William Adison, Proctors; Thomas French, Mayor. A.D. 1610-11.

About this time William Amese [Ames], Fellow of Christ's College in Cambridge, on St. Thomas's day, had, to use his own expression,† “the place of a watchman for an hour in the tower of the University;” and took occasion to inveigh against the liberty taken at that time, especially in such Colleges who had *lords of mis-rule*, a pagan relic, which, he said, as Polydore Virgil observeth, “remaineth only in England.”‡

Hence he proceeded to condemn all playing at cards and dice,

\* At this point commences another discrepancy between Fuller and Le Neve; the latter giving as the records of this year only Robert Soame, Vice-Chancellor, with Dearing and Cecill as Proctors; and Thomas Jegon, Vice-Chancellor of the following year, with Bridges and Disborough as Proctors. This error, on the part of Fuller, continues to the end of this Section, *anno* 1617; where the reader will find his own ingenuous acknowledgment of the mistake.—EDIT.

† In a letter I have of his to his friend.

‡ Lib. v. cap. 2.



affirming that the latter, in all ages, was accounted the device of the devil; that as God invented the one-and-twenty letters whereof he made the Bible, the devil, saith an author,\* found out the one-and-twenty pricks of the dice; that canon law forbade the use thereof, being *inventio diaboli nullâ consuetudine potest validari*.†

His sermon gave much offence to many of his auditors, the rather because in him there was a concurrence of much non-conformity, insomuch that, to prevent an expulsion from Dr. Cary, the Master, he fairly forsook the College, which proved unto him neither loss nor disgrace, being not long after, by the States of Friesland, chosen Professor in their University.

Valentine Cary, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Miriall and John Williams, Proctors; Thomas Smart, Mayor. A.D. 1611-12.

Clemens Corbet, Vice-Chancellor; Richard Thompson, Stephen Paget, and Henry Bird, Proctors; Edward Cropley, Mayor. 1612-13.

Samuel Harsenett, Vice-Chancellor; Arthur Johnson and Richard Anguish, Proctors; John Wicksted, Mayor. 1613-14.

Owen Gwin, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Kitchin and John Dod, Proctors; Thomas French, Mayor. 1614-15.

#### 56. *Mr. Sympson's Sermon and Recantation.*

John Hill, Vice-Chancellor; Andrew Pern and Thomas Smith, Proctors; Robert Lukin, Mayor. A.D. 1616-17.

Edward Sympson, (a very good scholar,) Fellow of Trinity College, preached a sermon before king James, at Royston, taking for his text, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." (John iii. 6.) Hence he endeavoured to prove, that the commission of any great sin doth extinguish grace and God's Spirit for the time in the man. He added also, that St. Paul, in the seventh chapter to the Romans, spake not of himself as an apostle and regenerate, but *sub statu legis*. Hereat his majesty took (and publicly expressed) great distaste, because Arminius had lately been blamed for extracting the like exposition out of the works of Faustus Socinus. Whereupon he sent to the two Professors in Cambridge, for their judgment herein, who proved and subscribed the place *ad Romanos septimo* to be understood of a regenerate man, according to St. Augustine's latter opinion in his "Retractions;" and the Preacher was enjoined a public recantation before the king, which accordingly was performed. Nor doth such a palinody sound any thing to his disgrace, having St. Augustine himself for his precedent, modestly retracting what formerly he had erroneously written therein.

\* ANTONIUS.

† LANGECRUCHIUS in *Speculo*.

John Richardson, Vice-Chancellor; John Browne and George Ramsey, Proctors; Henry King, Mayor. A. D. 1617-18.\*

*57. The first and last Knight Mayor of Cambridge.*

William Branthwait and John Goslin, Vice-Chancellors; John Smithson and Alexander Read, Proctors; sir Edward Hinde, knight, Mayor. A. D. 1618-19.

The neighbouring gentry of Cambridge, being very pleasant at a merry-meeting, resolved in a frolic to be made freemen, and so successively to take their turns in being Mayor thereof. The townsmen promised themselves great matters hereby, (betwixt whom and the University some petty animosities at present,) when persons of such state and quality should head their corporation, sir Edward Hinde, of Madingley, knight, led the dance, and kept his mayoralty in Cambridge, expecting others in order to follow him; who, considering the expensiveness of the place, (with some others no less politic than thrifty considerations,) receded from the resolution, and let the good knight alone, to possess that honour by himself. Townsmen (as formerly) succeeded him therein.

---

## SECTION IX.

THOMÆ PLAYER ARMIGERO, CAMERARII  
LONDINENSIS PRIMOGENITO.

TANDEM aliquando, Deo duce, post varios anfractus, et vias invias, ad Historiæ finem perventum est. Nec diffiteor me non fessum modò, sed et lassum, cùm mihi ita deficient vires, ut nunc, cùm pes sit figendus, vix possim me continere, ne pronus corruam. Opus mihi igitur jam concludenti, patrono, non FORTI minùs qui possit, quàm MITI qui velit, me nutantem sustentare, vel fortè labascentem erigere. Hîc tu mihi occurris exoptatissimus, qui tam mentis quàm corporis dotibus es spectabilis. Spero igitur finem, opus meum; certus scio, nomen tuum, finem operis coronaturum.

\* This and the subsequent paragraph are repeated, through mistake, in the next Section, page 225; where see Fuller's note.—EDIT.

1—3. *Henry Howard Chancellor of Cambridge. Sometimes it hits. His learned Book.* 15 James.

Here we have omitted (to confess and amend a fault is pardonable) how, after the decease of Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury, (one no less willing than able on all occasions to befriend the University,) dying *anno* 1612, Henry Howard, earl of Northampton, was chosen Chancellor of Cambridge. He was son to Henry earl of Surrey, (beheaded 1546, for a mere state-nicety,) and succeeded, as to his name, to his excellent parts and industry, being bred in King's College, where he attained to a great degree of eminency for learning.

He told his intimate Secretary,\* who related it to me, that his nativity, at his father's desire, was calculated by a skilful Italian astrologer; who told him, that this his infant-son should taste of much trouble in the midst of his life, even to the want of a meal's meat, but his old age should make amends for all, with a plentiful estate; which came to pass accordingly. For, his father dying in his infancy, no plentiful provision was made for him; and when his eldest brother, Thomas duke of Norfolk, was executed, his condition was much impaired: insomuch that once being in London, (not overstocked with money,) when his noble nephews, the earl of Arundel and the lord Thomas Howard, were out of the city, and loath to pin himself on any table uninvited, he was fain to dine with the chair of duke Humphrey, but other (not to say better) company, namely, reading of books in a stationer's shop in Paul's churchyard. But king James, coming to the crown, and beholding the Howards as his mother's martyrs, revived them with his favours; and this lord attained, under him, to great wealth, honour, and command.

However, this lord gave little credit to, and placed less confidence in, such predictions; as appeared by a learned work he hath written of that subject.† He died *anno* 1614: and his nephew, Thomas Howard, earl of Suffolk, succeeded him in the Chancellor's place of the University.

John Richardson, Vice-Chancellor; John Smithson and Alexander Read, Proctors; John Durant, Mayor. A.D. 1617–18.

4. *The Death of Dr. Butler.*

On the 29th of January died Mr. William Butler, the *Æsculapius* of our age; as, by the inscription on his marble tomb, in the chancel of St. Mary's, will appear:—

\* Mr. George Penny.  
Prophecies." — EDIT.

† "A Defensative against the Poison of supposed

*Nil, proh, marmor agis, Butlerum dum tegis, illum  
 Si splendore tuo nomen habere putas.  
 Ille tibi monumentum, tu digneris ab illo;  
 Butleri vivis munere marmor iners.  
 Sic homines vivus, sic mirâ mortuus arte,  
 Phæbo chare senex, vivere saxa facis.*

But the prose is higher than the verse; and might have served for Joseph of Arimathea to have inscribed on the monument of our Saviour; whereof this is a part:—

———*Abi, viator, et ad tuos reversus dic, te vidisse  
 Locum in quo salus jacet.*

He gave to Clare Hall, whereof he was Fellow, a chalice, with a cover of beaten gold, weighing and worth three hundred pounds, besides other plate and books, to the value of five hundred pounds.

William Branthwait and John Goslin, Vice-Chancellors; Henry Goch and Thomas Horseman, Proctors; Richard Foxton, Mayor. A. D. 1618–19.\*

5—8. *The Marquess of Hamilton made Earl of Cambridge. Mr. Preston prosecuted by the Commissary; and how escaping. The Lord Mainard foundeth a Logic-Professor. The Scholars' Number.*

The title of the earldom of Cambridge, which, as we have formerly observed, was only conferred on foreign princes, or those of the English blood-royal, had now lien dormant since the death of Richard Plantagenet, duke of York, and eighth earl of Cambridge.† It was now the king's pleasure, in imitation of his ancestors, (reserving that honour for some prime person,) to confer the same on his near kinsman, James marquess Hamilton; who, dying some six years after, left his title to James his son, the last earl during the extent of our History.

Robert Scot, Vice-Chancellor; William Roberts and Robert Mason, Proctors; Richard Foxton, Mayor. A. D. 1619–20.

\* To the list of *Errata*, at the close of the Index to the first edition (folio) of this work, Fuller has appended the subjoined note.—EDIT.

“Courteous reader, I am sensible of a mistake in the catalogue of Vice-Chancellors and Proctors of Cambridge, (besides a needless repetition of two, twice,) betwixt the years 1617 and 1620, inclusively. It arose from some difference betwixt the written copies I used, and such (I believe, the truer) as are since printed. I see what, not whither, to fly; who can discover, do confess, but (for the present) cannot rectify the error, craving the charitable assistance of my mother's sons herein. The best is, all the mistake lieth within the compass of three years, (all officers being right before and after,) and the fortunes of Greece, the truth, I mean, of our Church-History is not concerned therein.” See preceding page, 224. † This is one of the points disputed by Heylin; but in which Fuller, in his “Appeal,” proves himself to have been correct.

—EDIT.

Mr. John Preston, Fellow of Queen's, suspected for inclination to nonconformity, intended to preach in the afternoon, (St. Mary's sermon being ended,) in Botolph's church. But Dr. Newcomb, commissary to the Chancellor of Ely, offended with the pressing of the people, enjoined that service should be said without sermon. In opposition whereunto, a sermon was made without service; where large complaints to Lancelot Andrews, bishop of Ely, and, in fine, to the king himself. Hereupon Mr. Preston was enjoined to make what his foes call a *recantation*- his friends a *declaration*- sermon, therein so warily expressing his allowance of the liturgy, and set forms of prayer, that he neither displeased his own party, nor gave his enemies any great advantage.

Samuel Ward, Vice-Chancellor; Gabriel More and Philip Powlet, Proctors; Richard Foxton, Mayor. A.D. 1620-21.

William lord Mainard, first of Wicklow in Ireland, then of Estaines in England, brought up, when a young scholar, in St. John's College, (where Dr. Playfere thus versed it on his name,

*Inter menses MAIUS, et inter aromata NARDUS,)*

founded a place for a Logic-Professor, assigning him a salary of forty pounds *per annum*; and one Mr. Thornton, Fellow of the same College, made first Professor of that faculty.

Leonard Maw, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Scamp, Thomas Parkinson, and Charles Mordant, Proctors; Edward Potto, Mayor. A.D. 1621-22.

An exact survey was taken of the number of Students in the University, whose total sum amounted unto two thousand nine hundred ninety and eight.\*

Hierome Beale, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Adam and Nathanael Flick, Proctors; Thomas Atkinson, Mayor. A.D. 1622-23.

9-11. *A tough Canvass for Trinity-Lecture. Dr. Preston carries it clear. King James's last Coming to Cambridge.*

Thomas Paske, Vice-Chancellor; John Smith and Amias Ridding, Proctors; Thomas Purchas, Mayor. A.D. 1623-24.

The town-lecture at Trinity church being void, two appeared competitors for the same; namely, Dr. John Preston, now Master of Emmanuel, preacher at Lincoln's-Inn, and chaplain to prince Charles, generally desired by the townsmen, contributors to the lecture. Paul Micklethwait, Fellow of Sidney College, an eminent preacher, favoured by the diocesan bishop of Ely, and all the Heads of Houses, to have the place.

\* "Tables of John Scot."

The contest grew high and hard, insomuch as the Court was engaged therein. Many admired that Dr. Preston would stickle so much for so small a matter as an annual stipend of eighty pounds, issuing out of more than thrice eighty purses. But his party pleaded his zeal, not to get gold by—but to do good in—the place, where, (such the confluence of scholars to the church,) that he might *generare patres*, “beget begetters,” which made him to wave the bishopric of Gloucester, (now void, and offered unto him,) in comparison of this lecture.

At Dr. Preston's importunity, the duke of Buckingham, interposing his power, secured it unto him. Thus was he at the same time preacher to two places, (though neither had cure of souls legally annexed,) Lincoln's-Inn, and Trinity church in Cambridge. As Elisha cured the waters of Jericho, by going forth to the spring-head, and casting in salt there; so was it the design of this Doctor, for the better propagation of his principles, to infuse them into these two fountains, the one of Law, the other of Divinity. And some conceive that those doctrines by him then delivered have since had their use and application.

John Mansell, Vice-Chancellor; William Boswell and Thomas Bowles, Proctors; Thomas Purchas, Mayor. A.D. 1624–25.

King James came to Cambridge, lodged in Trinity College, was entertained with a Philosophy-Act, and other academical performances. Here, in an extraordinary Commencement, many (but ordinary) persons were graduated Doctors of Divinity, and other faculties.

12—15. *The Death of Mr. Andrew Downes. Mr. Creighton chosen his Successor. The Duke of Buckingham elected Chancellor. The Earl of Holland made Chancellor.* 1 Charles I. A.D. 1625.

Andrew Downes, Fellow of St. John's, one composed of Greek and industry, dieth; whose pains are so inlaid with sir Henry Saville's edition of Chrysostom, that both will be preserved together. Five were candidates for the Greek-Professor's place, void by his death; namely, Edward Palmer, esq. Fellow of Trinity College; Abraham Wheelocke, Fellow of Clare Hall; Robert Creighton, of Trinity; Ralph Winterton, of King's; and James White, Master of Arts, of Sidney College. How much was there now of Athens in Cambridge, when (besides many modestly concealing themselves) five able competitors appeared for the place!

All these read solemn lectures in the Schools on a subject appointed them by the electors; namely, the first verses of the

three-and-twentieth book of Homer's Iliads, chiefly insisting on,—

*Χαίρε μοι ὦ Πάτροκλε καὶ εἰν αἶδαι δόμοισι, &c.*

But the place was conferred on Mr. Robert Creighton, who, during Mr. Downes's aged infirmities, had (as Hercules relieved weary Atlas) supplied the same, possessed by the former full forty years.

John Goslin and Henry Smith, Vice-Chancellors; John Norton and Robert Ward, Proctors; Robert Lukin, Mayor. A.D. 1625–26.

Thomas Howard, earl of Suffolk, Chancellor of the University, departed this life; a hearty old gentleman, who was a good friend to Cambridge, and would have proved a better, if occasion had been offered. It argued the University's affection to his memory, that a grand party therein, unsought, unsent, unsued to, gave their suffrages for his second son, Thomas earl of Berkshire, though the duke of Buckingham, by very few voices, carried the place of the Chancellor. This duke gave the Beadles their old silver staves, and bestowed better and bigger on the University, with the king's and his own arms insculped thereon.

Henry Smith, Vice-Chancellor; Samuel Hixton and Thomas Wake, Proctors; Martin Peirse, Mayor. A.D. 1626–27.

Thomas Bambrigg, Vice-Chancellor; Thomas Love and Edward Lloyd, Proctors; John Shirwood, Mayor. 1627–28.

Henry earl of Holland, recommended by his Majesty to the University, is chosen Chancellor thereof, in the place of the duke of Buckingham, deceased.

16, 17. *The Lord Brooke founded an History-Professor. Dr. Dorislaus why accused.*

Sir Fulk Greville, lord Brooke, bred long since in Trinity College, founded a place for an History-Professor in the University of Cambridge, allowing him an annual stipend of an £100. Isaac Dorislaus, Doctor of the Civil Law, an Hollander, was first placed therein. Say not, This implied want of worthy men in Cambridge for that faculty; it being but fit, that founders should please their own fancy in the choice of the first Professor. This Doctor was a Dutchman, very much Anglicized in language and behaviour. However, because a foreigner, preferred to that place, his lectures were listened to with the more critical attention of Cambridge auditors.

Incomparable Tacitus he chose for his subject; and had not yet passed over those first words, *Urbem Romanam primò reges habu-*



ere, when some exception was taken at his comment thereon. How hard is it for liquors not to resent of the vessels they are poured through ! for vessels not to taste of that earth they are made of ! Being bred in a popular air, his words were interpreted by high monarchical ears, as over-praising a state, in disgrace of a kingdom. Hereupon he was accused to the king, troubled at court, and, after his submission, hardly restored to his place. This is that Dr. Dorislaus, Cambridge-Professor of History in his life, who himself was made an history at his death, slain in Holland, when first employed Ambassador from the Commonwealth unto the States of the United Provinces.

18—22. *Country Penury, Cambridge Plenty. The Candle-suit with the Townsmen. The Plague in Cambridge. Good Counsel. King Charles and Queen Mary come to Cambridge.*

A great scarcity followed after the plenty in (and men's unthankfulness for it) the former year, insomuch that wheat was sold in Cambridge market for ten shillings the bushel ; whereby a great improvement was made to the Fellowships of the old foundations ; which the more plainly appears by perusing the words of Master Bradford, written some eighty years before, when Fellow of Pembroke-Hall : " My Fellowship here is worth seven pounds a-year ; for I have allowed me eighteen pence a week, and as good as thirty-three shillings four-pence a-year in money, besides my chamber, launder, barber," \* &c. If, since, Fellows be sensible of the grand increase of their places, let them thank God for sir Thomas Smith, and thank his memory for procuring rent-corn unto them.

Matthew Wren, Vice-Chancellor ; Richard Love and Michael Honywood, Proctors ; John Badcock, Mayor. A.D. 1628—29.

A tough suit betwixt the University and town-chandlers ; chiefly on the account, whether candles came within the compass of *focalia*, and so to have their price reasonably rated by the Vice-Chancellor. The townsmen betook themselves to their lawyers, the Scholars to the lords, plying the Privy-Council with learned letters ; by whose favour they got the better ; and some refractory townsmen, by being discommoned, were humbled into obedience.

Henry Buts, Vice-Chancellor ; Thomas Goad and William Roberts, Proctors ; Samuel Spalding, Mayor. A.D. 1629—1630.

The plague brake forth in Cambridge. The University in some sort was dissolved, and Scholars dispersed into the country. Three hundred forty-seven of the town-folk died of the infection. As

\* In his letter to Mr. Traves, Fox's " Acts and Monuments," p. 1664.

God's hand was just upon—man's was merciful unto—the town of Cambridge; and the signal bounty of London (amounting to some thousands of pounds) deserves never to be forgotten. But this corruption of the air proved the generation of many Doctors, graduated in a clandestine way, without keeping any Acts, to the great disgust of those who had fairly gotten their degrees with public pains and expense. Yea, Dr. Collins, being afterwards to admit an able man Doctor, did (according to the pleasantness of his fancy) distinguish *inter cathedram pestilentiae, et cathedram eminentiae*, leaving it to his auditors easily to apprehend his meaning therein.

After the return of the Scholars, one of the first that preached in St. Mary's minded the University of gratitude to God, who had dealt with them, said he, as the children, sons of kings, are used; whose servants, for the more state, are beaten when their young masters are in fault. The plague light on the townsmen; though Scholars ought to examine themselves, whether they were not the chief offenders.

Henry Buts, Vice-Chancellor; Peter Ashton and Roger Hockstater, Proctors; William Holland, Mayor. A.D. 1630–31.

Henry Buts and Thomas Cumber, Vice-Chancellors; Thomas Tyrwhit and Lionel Gatford, Proctors; Thomas Purchas, Mayor. A.D. 1631–32.

King Charles and queen Mary came to Cambridge, were entertained at Trinity College with comedies, and expressed candid acceptance thereof.

23—26. *Master Adams founds an Arabic Professorship. A smart Passage in a Sermon. Mr. Bernard gives Distaste with his Preaching. Convented in the High Commission, refuseth to recant, and dieth.*

Thomas Adams, (then citizen, since lord mayor,) of London, deservedly commended for his Christian constancy in all conditions, founded an Arabian Professorship, on condition it were frequented with competency of auditors. And, notwithstanding the general jealousy that this new Arabia (*happy*, as all novelties at the first) would soon become *desert*; yet, it seems, it thrived so well, that the salary was settled on Abraham Wheelock, Fellow of Clare Hall. His industrious mind had vast stowage for words, and is lately dead; whose longer life had, in all probability, been very advantageous to the new edition of *the Bible in many languages*; an excellent work, and may it be as happily performed, as it is worthily undertaken.

A grave divine, preaching before the University, at St. Mary's, had this passage in his sermon, that, as at the Olympian games HE

was counted the conqueror who<sup>d</sup> could drive his chariot-wheels nearest the mark, yet so as not to hinder his running, or to stick thereon,

—————*melaque fervidis*  
*Evitata rotis* ; —————

so he who in his sermons could preach near popery, and yet no popery, “there was your man.” And, indeed, it now began to be the general complaint of most moderate men, that many in the University, both in the Schools and pulpits, approached the opinions of the church of Rome nearer than ever before.

Mr. Bernard, a discontinuer, and lecturer of St. Sepulchre’s, in London, preached at St. Mary’s in the afternoon, May 6th ; his text, 1 Sam. iv. 21 : “The glory is departed from Israel,” &c. In handling whereof, he let fall some passages which gave distaste to a prevalent party in the University ; as for saying, “1. God’s ordinances, when blended and adulterated with innovations of men, cease to be God’s ordinances, and he owneth them no longer. 2. That it is impossible any should be saved, living and dying (without repentance) in the doctrine of Rome, as the Tridentine Council hath decreed it. 3. That treason is not limited to the blood royal ; but that he is a traitor against a nation that depriveth it of God’s ordinances. 4. That some shamefully symbolize in Pelagian errors and superstitious ceremonies with the church of Rome. Let us pray such to their conversion, or to their destruction,” &c.

Dr. Cumber, Vice-Chancellor, gave speedy notice hereof to Dr. Laud, bishop of London, though he (so quick his University intelligence) had information thereof before. Hereupon he was brought into the High Commission, and a recantation tendered unto him, which he refused to subscribe, though professing his sincere sorrow and penitency, in his petitions and letters to the bishop, for any oversights and unbecoming expressions in his sermon. Hereupon, he was sent back to the new prison, where he died. If he was miserably abused therein by the keepers, (as some have reported,) to the shortening of his life, “He that maketh inquisition for blood,” either hath [been], or will be, a revenger thereof.

Benjamin Lany, Vice-Chancellor ; John Lothian and Daniel Chaundeler, Proctors ; George Saunders, Mayor. A. D. 1632–33.

Richard Love, Vice-Chancellor ; Henry Molle and Luke Skippon, Proctors ; Robert Twelves, Mayor. 1633–34.

### • 27. *Organs erected in Chapels.*

Now began the University to be much beautified in buildings, every College either casting its skin with the snake, or renewing its bill with the eagle ; having their courts, or at leastwise their fronts

and gate-houses, repaired and adorned. But the greatest alteration was in their chapels, most of them being graced with the accession of organs. And, seeing Music is one of the liberal arts, how could it be quarrelled at in an University, if they “sang with understanding” both of the matter and manner thereof? Yet some took great distaste thereat, as attendancy\* to superstition.

---

AT this time I discontinued my living in the University; and therefore crave leave here to break off my History, finding it difficult to attain to certain intelligence. However, because I meet with much printed matter about the visitation of Cambridge in these troublesome times, (though after some years’ interval,) I shall, for a conclusion, adventure to give posterity an impartial relation thereof:—

*28—32. College-plate sent to the King. The Act aggravated, and excused. Three Doctors imprisoned in the Tower, and the Vice-Chancellor in Ely-House.*

Richard Houldsworth being Vice-Chancellor. A.D. 1641—42.

August 31st. The Masters and Fellows of all Colleges send their plate, (or money in lieu thereof,) to the king to York; many wishing that every ounce thereof were a pound for his sake, conceiving it unfitting that they should have superfluities to spare, whilst their sovereign wanted necessities to spend.

This was beheld by the parliament as an act unjust in itself, and dangerous in the consequence thereof; for the present Masters and Fellows were only fiduciaries, not proprietaries, of the plate,—to keep and use it, not to dispose thereof. Was not this obliterating the records of gentlemen’s bounty, who had conferred those costly utensils on the Colleges? Besides, this was interpreted a fomenting of the civil war, thereby encouraging and enabling the king against his subjects.

In vain did the Heads plead for themselves, that they, affrighted at the plundering of the house of the countess of Rivers, at Long-Melford, (the firstfruits of rapine in our age,) did suspect the like violence. Plunderers have long arms, and can quickly reach out of Suffolk into Cambridgeshire. For prevention whereof, they thought good to secure some of their plate in a safe hand; and could not find a fitter than his majesty’s, heir to his ancestors, the founders

\* It is difficult to divine whether Fuller employed this word in the sense of “attendance,” or whether he wished it to convey a meaning somewhat allied to our more usual phrase of “having a tendency to” any thing.—EDIT.

paramount of all Houses. Besides, though the clouds look black with a louring complexion, yet did it not rain war downright betwixt king and parliament, it being some days before the erecting of his standard at Nottingham.

Dr. Beale, Dr. Martin, and Dr. Sterne, Masters of St. John's, Queen's, and Jesus Colleges, are carried to London, and imprisoned in the Tower, for their activity in the plate business. And Cambridge is made the seat of "the Committee for the Eastern Association," which escaped the best of all parts in this civil war, the *smoke* thereof only offending those counties, whilst the *fire* was felt in other places.

Richard Houldsworth, Vice-Chancellor. Before his year expired, he was seized on, and imprisoned, first in Ely-House, then in the Tower, for executing his majesty's command in printing at Cambridge such his Declarations as were formerly printed at York.

### 33, 34. *The Heads deny the Parliament Money. The Death of Dr. Ward.*

March 30th. The Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Houses, solemnly assembled in the consistory, were demanded to contribute to the parliament, so to redeem their forwardness in supplying the king. Which, performed by them, would, notwithstanding their former crooked carriage in the cause, bolster them upright in the parliament's esteem. But they persisted in the negative, "that such contributing was against true religion and a good conscience;" for which some of them were afterwards imprisoned in St. John's College.

Amongst these was Dr. Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney College, and Divinity Professor, Lady Margaret's, (or "the king's" shall I say?) in the University. For, though the former by his foundation, he may seem the latter by his resolution. Yet was he a Moses, not only for slowness of speech, but, otherwise, meekness of nature. Indeed, when in my private thoughts I have beheld him and Dr. Collins, (disputable whether more different or more eminent in their endowments,) I could not but remember the running of Peter and John to the place where Christ was buried. In which race John came first, as the youngest and swiftest; but Peter first entered into the grave. Dr. Collins had much the speed of him in quickness of parts; but let me say, (nor doth the relation of a pupil misguide me,) the other pierced the deeper into underground and profound points of divinity. Now, as high winds bring some men the sooner into sleep, so I conceive the storms and tempests of these distracted times invited this good old man the sooner to his long rest, where we fairly leave him, and quietly draw the curtains about him.

35, 36. *The Oath of Discovery tendered, and refused. Mr. Ash disavoweth any such Oath.*

Now approached the general doom of "malignant members" (so termed) in the University; the earl of Manchester, with his two chaplains, Mr. Ash and Mr. Good, coming thither to effect a reformation. In preparation whereunto, I read how an oath of discovery \* was tendered to many, and universally refused, "as against all law and conscience, as being thereby made to accuse their nearest and dearest friends, benefactors, Tutors, and Masters, and betray the members and acts of their several Societies, contrary to their peaceable statutes, namely, *Non revelabis aliquod secretum Collegii, nec malum aut damnum intferes cuilibet Sociorum*. Whereupon this oath was generally denied.

To be satisfied in the truth hereof, I wrote to Mr. Ash, (whose face I had never seen,) requesting him to inform me,—such proceedings seeming very strange to my apprehension. But hear his answer:—

"TRULY, Sir, I am so great a stranger to that *Oath of Discovery* which you mention, that I cannot call to mind the moving of any such matter, by the lord of Manchester, or any who attended him. And as for myself, having been a sufferer upon the dislike of the oath *ex officio*, I have, all along my life, been very tender in appearing as an instrument in any such matter. Sir, I may be under mistakes through forgetfulness, but I hope there is a principle within me which will not suffer me to suggest an untruth willingly.

"Your loving friend,

"*London, July 10th, 1654.*

SIMON ASH."

Here we see what he writes, and what others print. If there was any such oath, it seems it had the happiness of a short part; and, sensible of its own ill-acting therein, it sneaked down so quickly into the tiring-house, that it hopes not to be remembered ever to have come upon the stage. But if Mr. Ash was active herein, I see stripes are not so soon forgotten by those that bear them, as by those that lay them on. For my own part, I am satisfied no such oath was tendered *by him*, charitably believing, that he would not cross his own doctrine, when, preaching to the parliament, *anno* 1640, on Psalm ix. 9: "The Lord is a refuge for the oppressed," he complained of the strictness of University-oaths.†

\* *Querela Cantabrigiensis*, page 20.

† See this whole matter fully discussed in "the Appeal of Injured Innocence," Book xi. part 2. paragraph 323.

37, 38. *The Covenant generally tendered, and refused.*

Not long after, warning was given, that all Students should come in within twelve days, and take the Covenant.\* This seemed a strange summons; and the two chaplains (to whom the earl of Manchester, most mild in himself, chiefly remitted the managing of these matters) were challenged for injustice herein. For, though divines, they were presumed to have so much of civil law, yea, of the law of nature, as to know, *Nemo tenetur ad impossibilia*, "No man is tied to impossibilities;" whereas many Scholars, being absent more scores of miles than they had days allowed them, (besides the danger of armies interposed,) could not, if receiving warning, repair at the time appointed. But because many of them were suspected to be in the king's army, twelve days were conceived for them as much as twelve months;† no time being too short for those who were willing, and none long enough for such who were unwilling, to take the Covenant.

This Covenant, being offered, was generally refused; whereupon the recusants were ordered, without any delay, to pack out of the University three days after their ejection.

39—42. *Offence taken at Bishop Brownrigg's Sermon. Ejection of Masters, Fellows, and Scholars from Queen's College. What became of so many ejected Fellows. The Chaplains' Plea for themselves.*

Dr. Brownrigg, bishop of Exeter, and Master of Catherine Hall, was now Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, succeeding Dr. Holdsworth, as I take it; for, know, reader, I begin now to be incurious in chronology; not so much because weary with a long observing thereof, as because, such the noise of the present disturbance, I cannot hear what the clock of time doth strike. This sure I am, that the Vice-Chancellor, though eminent for his piety, gravity, and learning, could so little prevail for others, (endeavouring all the good offices he could,) that the next year he was banished the University, for preaching the inauguration-sermon of the king, wherein many passages were distasted by the parliament-party. And now they vigorously proceeded, having learned the maxim in Hippocrates, that *licet in extremis ad lipothymiam vacuare*, "In desperate cures, one may let blood, even till the patient swoons:" on confidence, that though the soul dissembleth a departure, yet it will stay still in the body, especially when finding it amended in the temper thereof. And, it seems, the blood appeared so corrupt to these physicians,

\* *Querela Cantabrigiensis*, page —  
a longer time was given them.

† Mr. Ash informed me, that, afterward,



that so great a quantity was taken away, some Colleges lay, as it were, languishing for the loss thereof.

In Queen's College there was made a thorough reformation, neither Master, Fellow, nor Scholar being left of the Foundation; so that, according to the laws of the admiralty, it might seem a true wreck, and forfeited, in this land-tempest, for lack of a live thing therein, to preserve the propriety thereof. However, some conceived this a great severity, contrary to the eternal moral of the Jewish law, provided against the depopulation of birds' nests, that the old and young ones should be destroyed together. But, to prevent a vacuity, (the detestation of nature,) a new plantation was soon substituted in their room, who, short of the former in learning and abilities, went beyond them in good affections to the parliament.

However, on the account of humanity, some pity may seem due to such Fellows, outed house and home, merely for refusing the Covenant, being otherwise well-deserving, in the judgments of those who ejected them. And it is strange to conceive how many of them got any subsistence or livelihood to maintain themselves. This mindeth me of the occasion of the Greek proverb:—\* *ἢ τέθνηκεν ἢ διδάσκει γράμματα*, “He is either dead, or teacheth school.” For when Nicias, the general of Athens, (having many scholars in his army,) had fought unfortunately against the Sicilians, and when such few as returned home were interrogated, what became of their companions, this was all they could return, “They were either dead, or taught school;” a poor and woful employment, it seems, in those days, as weighed in the other scale against death,—so indifferent was the odds betwixt them. The same we conceive the hard hap of such Fellows that survived the grief of their ejection. Many betook themselves to the painful profession of schoolmaster; no calling which is honest being disgraceful, especially to such who, for their conscience' sake, have deserted a better condition.

I know what the chaplains of the earl have pleaded, in excuse of their rigorous proceedings against the Scholars at this time; namely, “That authority was much exasperated by Academics deserting their places, and refusing, upon summons given, to come in with petitions for favour in relation to such particulars wherein they were dissatisfied; that, as if the times were their *text*, whatever the *subject* of their sermons, they were invective against the present authority; that *Querela Cantabrigiensis* is but *Querela*, relating all things to the worst, and complaints are no proofs; that, for their own parts, they only answered the spur, and scarcely that, being quickened on both sides, both from above and beneath, and

\* Zenodotus the author thereof.

daily complained of, that their over-remissness would obstruct reformation, both in church and University." How far this will prevail on the belief of posterity, is unto me unknown.

#### 43. *Great Alteration in Heads of Houses.*

Some perchance may be so curious hereafter to know what removals and substitutions were made at this time, amongst the Heads of Houses. Now, although a man may hold a candle to lighten posterity so near as to burn his own fingers therewith, I will run the hazard, rather than be wanting to any reasonable desire.

MASTERS PUT OUT.	COLLEGES.	MASTERS PUT IN.
1. Dr. John Cosins, dean of Peterborough, and prebendary of Durham.	Peter House.	Lazarus Seaman, minister in London, bred in Emmanuel College, since D.D.
2. Dr. Thomas Pask, archdeacon of London.	Clare Hall.	Ralph Cudworth, Fellow of Emmanuel College, since D.D.
3. Dr. Benjamin Laney, dean of Rochester.	Pembroke Hall.	Richard Vines, bred in Magdalen College, afterward outed for refusing the Engagement.
4. Dr. Thomas Badcroft.	Caius College.	William Dell, admitted first into Emmanuel College.
5. Dr. Samuel Collins, the King's Professor.	King's College.	Benjamin Whichcot, Fellow of Emmanuel College, since D.D.
6. Dr. Edward Martin, chaplain to archbishop Laud.	Queen's College.	Herbert Palmer, formerly Fellow of the same College.
7. Ralph Brownrigge, bishop of Exeter.	Catherine Hall.	William Spurstow, Fellow, and outed for refusing the Engagement.
8. Dr. Richard Sterne, chaplain to archbishop Laud.	Jesus College.	Timothy [Thomas] Young, bred in Scotland, outed for refusing the Engagement.

MASTERS PUT OUT	COLLEGES.	MASTERS PUT IN.
9. Dr. William Beale, chaplain to the king.	St. John's Coll.	John Arrowsmith, Fellow of Catherine Hall, since D.D.
10. Dr. Thomas Cumber, dean of Carlisle.	Trinity College.	Thomas Hill, Fellow of Emmanuel College, since D.D.
11. Dr. Richard Holdsworth, archdeacon of Huntingdon.	Emmanuel Coll.	Anthony Tuckney, formerly Fellow, since D.D.
12. Dr. Samuel Ward (in effect but a prisoner) died a natural death.	Sidney College.	Richard Minshull, Fellow, since D.D. chosen by the Society into the void place.

Four Masters, by the especial favours of their friends, and their own wary compliance, continued in their places; namely, Dr. Thomas Bainbrigg; [Master of Christ's College;] and Dr. Thomas Eden, of Trinity Hall; but died soon after; Dr. Richard Love, Master of Bene't College, afterwards Margaret Professor; and Dr. Edward Rainbow, of Magdalen College, who not long after lost his Mastership, for the refusal of the Engagement.

44, 45. *The sad Effects of War. Townsmen tax Scholars.*

Pass we now from the *'Ακαδημία ἔμψυχος*, "the living," consisting of Students, to the *ἄψυχος*, "the dead University," as composed of lands, libraries, and buildings; where we meet with many moans in this kind: How soldiers were now quartered in their Colleges; chapels abused; Common-prayer books, yet legally in force, torn in St. Mary's; their bridges broken down; materials for building Colleges taken away; Jesus-College grove (no idolatrous one) cut down to the ground; ancient coins of St. John's College taken away, valued at twenty-two pounds, according to weight, though an hundred times worth more than they were worth, wherein every piece was a volume, and all together a library of Roman antiquities.

But chiefly it vexed them, that their lands, hitherto exempted from payments, and, like *his* father's house who should conquer Goliath, free in Israel, (1 Sam. xvii. 25,) were now subjected to taxes, wherein the raters were heavier than the rates, being taxed by the townsmen. And how "odious is a handmaid that is heir to her mistress;" (Prov. xxx. 23;) but much more when mistress of

her mistress, as here the town, in some sort, was over the University, where such who set the lowest price on learning put the highest valuation on the Professors thereof.

46, 47. *Moderate Men's Judgment. St. Andrew's Church repaired.*

However, there are University-men, (not altogether so passionate for, but every whit as affectionate to, their mother,) who, as they condole Cambridge for faring so ill, congratulate her also for faring no worse, in such tumultuous times. When all the body is distempered, with what hope can either eye promise ease unto itself? Was their glass broken? It was well their windows were left. Was the floor of some of their chapels digged up? Well that the walls of them were not digged down. Were one or two of their bridges broken? It was well that any was spared from whence Cam-bridge might still retain her denomination.

Now, that my sun may not set in a cloud, amidst many bemoanings of Cambridge, I must rejoice, that the ruins of one ancient church, St. Andrew's by name, are repaired by the joint benefaction of many, and particularly of Richard Rose, esq. late Mayor of Cambridge, and sheriff of Cambridgeshire. Let him who hath the building of God's house (whilst living) for his monument, have the praise of posterity for his never-dying epitaph.

48, 49. *The Author's just Apology. A witty homonymous Answer. A Prayer.*

Here some may expect, according to my promise, an "History of the University of Oxford:" but, finding my informations thence (assisted with my own industry) to fall short of filling a just treatise, I thought fit to insert their Colleges in the body of my History, according to the dates of their respective foundations, submitting the censure of my fair dealing therein to the ingenuous in that famous University.

To draw to conclusion: lately a College in Cambridge, much beautified with additional buildings, sent a messenger to a Doctor, no less ingenious than bountiful, who had been a great, and promised to be a greater, benefactor unto them, requesting him to remember them, "or else their College must even *stand still*," meaning they must desist from going farther in their intended fabric. To whom the Doctor answered, "May your College, and all the Colleges in both Universities, *stand still*!" In the charitable meaning whereof all good men will concur, and join with us in our following devotions:—

## A PRAYER.

O God! who, in the creating of the lower world, didst first make light,\* (confusedly diffused, as yet, through the imperfect universe,) and afterwards didst collect the same into two great lights,† to illuminate all creatures therein: O Lord! who art a God of knowledge, and dost lighten every man that cometh into the world:‡ O Lord! who in our nation hast moved the hearts of founders and benefactors to erect and endow two famous luminaries of learning and religion, bless them with the assistance of thy Holy Spirit. Let neither of them contest (as once thy disciples on earth,) which should be the greatest,§ but both contend which shall approve themselves the best in thy presence.

O, though for their sins thou permittest them to be eclipsed, for thy mercy do not suffer them to be extinguished.

And as thou didst appoint those two great lights in the firmament to last till thy servants shall have no need of the sun nor of the moon to shine therein, for thy glory doth lighten them:|| so grant these old lights may continue till all acquired and infused knowledge be swallowed up with the vision and fruition of thy blessed-making majesty. Amen.

END OF THE HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

---

 ADDITIONAL NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

MANY persons who are accustomed to consider Cambridge as having been pre-eminently a mathematical University *ab initio*, will be surprised to find exceedingly slight allusions to this subject in FULLER'S "History." William Oughtred, of King's College, is the only one whom he has particularly distinguished, among the "many eminent persons still surviving, prince of the mathematicians of our age;" while a man of far greater genius and more extensive acquirements, who was undoubtedly *the most eminent mathematician of those early days*, and one to whom mathematical science in some of its highest departments is more deeply indebted than many conceited moderns are willing to allow, is dismissed with this very brief and indistinct notice, under "the learned writers" of Emmanuel College,—"John Wallis is now Geometry-Professor in Oxford." Samuel Foster, of the same College, is also recorded as having been a learned writer "of Mathematics." The reader has now before him the FULLEST of our Fuller's enumeration of the mathematical talent of the University; and he will

\* Gen. i. 3.      † Verse 16.      ‡ John i. 9.      § Luke xxii. 24.      || Rev. xxi. 23.

thence correctly conclude, that this was a department of learning in which Cambridge was then accounted to have no peculiar excellence : otherwise our author, in his pardonable zeal, would have claimed for his *Alma Mater* supreme mathematical honours. Yet if any one will cast but a cursory glance over the names appended to the extremely varied productions in the *Musæ Cantabrigienses*, on some of the great public occasions soon after the Restoration, (such as the royal marriage, the death of Henrietta Maria, the queen-mother,) will be amazed at the mass of mathematical talent which had been in a course of germination during the Interregnum. Speculation and theorizing in religion, philosophy, and politics had then attained their utmost elevation ; and it is a remarkable fact, that, with the exception of those who had been preserved in the better and higher principles in which they had been carefully educated, all the famous persons that composed the original nucleus from which the Royal Society had its commencement, and all those who in this University exclusively were distinguished by the honourable appellative of "latitude-men," had been generally trained up as strict predestinarians in religion, republicans in politics, and very little better than admirers of Paracelsus, or of the mystical Rosicrucians, in philosophy. But that great revolution in England which is commonly viewed only in its *political* aspect and bearing, was as mighty and wonderful in its *religious* and *philosophical* issues. The discussions connected with every subject of human knowledge which very naturally arose at such an exciting period, called into healthful exercise the profound and heavenly-gifted powers of many, with whom the noblest faculties would, in all human probability, under ordinary circumstances, have lain dormant and neglected. These great men entered heartily into the various departments of the inductive system of Bacon's philosophy, and introduced its principles into the modification which was then formed of their religious and political opinions and practice. Whatsoever, therefore, did not recommend itself at once to their understanding through the tests of experiment, ceased to form any part of their political, philosophical, or religious creed. The blessed results are to be traced in the salutary checks and provisions which have progressively been admitted into the admirable constitution under which it is our privilege to live, and in those amazing improvements and discoveries, in every branch of human knowledge, which we have been permitted to behold. Some temporary injury was certainly inflicted on their religious principles by this arrangement ; but it was in its nature such as was to be expected by every sound philosopher who has studied that propensity which inheres in the human mind toward strong moral re-action, on the accession of those new and overpowering views and feelings which it concludes to be true and correct. After the many years in which an antinomian faith had been rampant among all classes of those professors of Christianity who had adopted the dogmas of rigid predestination, it is not surprising that the manly practical writers who succeeded them, in

endeavouring to counteract what was deemed to be a pernicious error in the doctrine and practice of their predecessors, should exclude from their clever and powerful treatises nearly all mention of faith, except in its lowest acceptation of *mere historical belief*. But that infinitely Wise and Benignant Being, who kindly watches over the rising interests of his militant church, provided a remedy in due season; and, by wonderful means of his own devising, brought about that healthy state of religion which marks the present age, exhibiting generally a happy consistency between Christian faith and practice, between official doctrine and personal example.

Such was the early cradling or *incunabula* of the Mathematics at Cambridge; and, within three years after the Restoration of monarchy, the want of some adequate provision for the public encouragement of this interesting and delightfully-multifarious study having been felt and regretted, the truly honourable HENRY LUCAS, Member of Parliament for the University, founded and endowed that noble Professorship of Mathematics, which will transmit his undying name to the latest ages, and the chair of which has been filled by men of transcendent talents, from Barrow and Newton its earliest occupants, to Airy and Babbage their gifted and more recent successors.

But every one who is observant of the progress which any particular branch of ennobling study has made in our great nurseries of learning, even after it has met with as ready and cordial a reception as in the present instance, must know that still the advances of a favourite science may be correctly designated as being "slow and gradual," before it can obtain the general regard due to its increasing claims, or secure for itself permanent attention. About half a century elapsed, from the founding of the Mathematical Professorship, before those able men with whom rested the choice of the best course of learning to be pursued, were induced to adopt the Mathematics for a leading academical study, and one of the most useful instruments which they could employ in forming thoughtful habitudes and shining characters. This great and gradual change, and the effects which it soon produced, are well described in the words of one of its original promoters, Dr. Edmund Law, afterwards lord bishop of Carlisle, in the preface to his translation of archbishop KING's "Essay on the Origin of Evil:"—

"But, enough of these trifling particulars, which have detained me from a more important point intended for this place, namely, surveying the too general turn of our University education. Having, therefore, about the time above-mentioned, (1723,) remarked some abuses in the training up of our youth, by beginning it with inculcating the dull, crabbed system of Aristotle's Logic, and at a time when they were least capable of applying that to any valuable purpose; by persisting to retail such an idle system, even after it was grown obsolete, and not rather laying some solid foundation in natural philosophy, with its modern improvements, or 'natural law,' as the whole doctrine of morals is now termed; which would be of constant use to these young dis-



ciples, in what way of life soever they might afterwards be engaged, and likewise help to settle in them right notions of religion ; which would, above all things, tend to make them more sober-minded, and, consequently, more submissive to their superiors here, as well as more happy in themselves for ever hereafter. Reflecting on these absurdities which still prevailed in our public forms of education, some of my friends were induced to seek a remedy, by freeing their pupils from all that pedantic jargon, and introducing some better means to engage their attention, and accustom them to a close, regular way of thinking, and thereby prosecuting their future studies with greater accuracy and precision : to this end they called in the assistance of the Mathematics, little then imagining, that in a short time these same assistants, these comparatively meagre instruments, should, like Pharaoh's lean kine, eat up all that was good and well favoured in the sciences themselves ; that they should usurp the place of those very sciences to which they were originally designed to be subservient, and for which station they were sufficiently qualified. But such became the common infatuation, that these helps for conducting an inquiry through the whole Cyclopædia, instead of continuing to perform such useful offices, were, by the mere force of fashion, set up for a capital branch of it, and the best part of our scholars' time spent in speculating on these same instruments ; which would, in any other case, appear perhaps to be somewhat preposterous. However, these favourite speculations did not at first so far engross all the thoughts of our young students, as not to admit some points of a moral and metaphysical kind to accompany them ; which last held their ground for above twenty years ; and, together with Mr. Locke's Essay, Dr. Clarke went hand in hand through our public schools and lectures, though they were built on principles directly opposite to each other ; the latter of them founding all our moral knowledge on certain innate 'instincts,' or absolute 'fitnesses,' however inconsistent these two terms may appear, the former being wholly calculated to remove them : till, at length, certain flaws being discovered in the Doctor's celebrated argument, *a priori*, (on the truth of which many minute philosophers had wholly pinned their faith,) his doctrine fell into disrepute, and was generally given up ; but its downfall, at the same time, sunk the credit of that whole science, as to the certainty of its principles, which thereby received so great a shock as is hardly yet recovered. This threw us back into a more eager attachment than ever to its rival, the Mathematics, which grew from henceforth into a most important and most laborious study, being confined chiefly to the deepest and most difficult parts of them, and taking up the student's whole time and pains, so as to become incompatible with any other much more necessary studies, as will appear below. And here one cannot avoid stopping to lament the notorious weakness of the human mind ; which, instead of exerting its own native powers of examining and judging in points of faith, is ever apt to shelter itself under some sorry system of opinions, accidentally thrown in its way ; and through

mere indolence, or perhaps dread of that *odium theologicum* which too often attends on each attempt toward any improvement, or what is called 'innovation,' (though it be no more, in reality than removing those innovations made by time, the greatest of all innovators, according to Lord Bacon,) sits down contented with its ancient state of ignorance and blind credulity, willing to connive at all those gross and glaring absurdities that have long beset it, and been suffered to continue in so many learned and religious societies. But it is hoped, that most of these are already seen through, and will shortly be discarded by the laudable endeavours of the University of Cambridge in particular; which is labouring to reform such abuses, and restore its credit to that first degree in arts, and the exercise preparatory to it, which was once the peculiar glory of this place; and whereupon not only the academical character of each candidate, but likewise his success in life, does still very much depend; well aware that this long-desired piece of reformation can never be secured effectually, but by a careful and impartial distribution of those honours which usually attend the said promotion,—a prospect whereof is found to be the great object of ambition to many of these young men from the very time of their admission into College: to this they often sacrifice their whole stock of strength and spirits, and so entirely devote most of their first four years to what is called *taking a good degree*, as to be hardly good for any thing else, least of all for a proper discharge of that important duty to which the greatest part of them were originally destined, and which ought to be the chief business of their future lives; but to which, alas! they have hitherto been utter strangers. A sad truth! of which we are made very sensible in the mortifying office of examining such persons for holy orders."

All who are conversant with the ecclesiastical history of those times will understand the meaning of the good bishop, when he deplores "the notorious weakness of the human mind, which, instead of exerting its own native powers of examining and judging in points of faith, is ever apt to shelter itself under some sorry system of opinions accidentally thrown in its way," &c.; and the vast prevalence of Arian darkness among his personal friends, from Carlisle to Richmond and Catterick, leaving scarcely one of the intervening places unvisited, will explain the source of the bishop's dissatisfaction. The quotation is valuable on another account: It serves to show, by implication at least, that the much-traduced Mathematics are not, necessarily and *per se*, inimical to religion; on the contrary, an inference fairly deducible from bishop Law's lament, is, that a devotion to those studies fortifies the youthful mind against yielding too easily to the attacks of heretical pravity. Other remarks, unavoidably brief, connected with the chief purpose for which I have quoted these words, are reserved for another part of this note.

While writing these lines I am reminded of an expression employed by the late archbishop Markham. The respectable vicar of a large and

populous parish in Yorkshire, with whom it was my happiness in very early life to live on terms of intimacy, had written to his Grace in behalf of a clever Cambridge-man, who had taken a high degree, and whom he was desirous of engaging as his curate, after he had received deacon's orders. The reply of the archbishop, dignified yet playful, was read to me the morning after its arrival; and as two hopeful Oxford-graduates had likewise been mentioned in my aged friend's communication, he was told, without any appearance of acrimony, though his Grace was himself an eminent Oxonian, that Cambridge-men were usually well-qualified to excel as clever excisemen, but that few of them ever became good divines. There may be some shrewdness in this piece of pleasantry; but it is unaccompanied with those incontrovertible essentials of truth which never mislead, as the reader will perceive when he has perused the candid and sensible observations of that highly gifted and very amiable man, archbishop Whately, which form a part of the "Preface" to his celebrated "Elements of Logic," and which I here subjoin, in proof that Oxford scholars are not insensible of some defects in their system:—

"It was doubtless from a strong and deliberate conviction of the advantages, direct and indirect, accruing from an acquaintance with logic, that the University of Oxford, when re-modelling their system, not only retained that branch of study, regardless of the clamours of many of the half-learned, but even assigned a prominent place to it, by making it an indispensable part of the examination for the first degree. This last circumstance, however, I am convinced, has, in a great degree, produced an effect opposite to what was designed. It has contributed to lower, instead of exalting, the estimation of the study; and to withhold from it the earnest attention of many who might have applied to it with profit. I am not so weak as to imagine that any system can ensure great proficiency in any pursuit whatever, either in all students, or in a very large proportion of them: 'we sow many seeds to obtain a few flowers:' but it might have been expected, (and doubtless was expected,) that a majority at least of successful candidates would derive some benefit worth mentioning from their logical pursuits; and that a considerable proportion of the distinguished candidates would prove respectable, if not eminent, logicians. Such expectations I do not censure as unreasonable, or such as I might not have formed myself, had I been called upon to judge at that period when our experience was all to come. Subsequently, however, experience has shown that those expectations have been very inadequately realized. The truth is, that a very small proportion, even of distinguished students, ever become proficient in logic; and that by far the greater part pass through the University without knowing anything at all of the subject. I do not mean that they have not learned by rote a string of technical terms; but that they understand absolutely nothing whatever of the principles of the science.

“Theology, not being a science, admits of infinite degrees of proficiency, from that which is within the reach of a child, up to the highest that is attainable by the most exalted genius; every one of which degrees is inestimably valuable as far as it goes. If any one understands tolerably the Church Catechism, or even the half of it, he knows something of divinity; and that something is incalculably preferable to nothing. But it is not so with a science: one who does not understand the principles of Euclid’s demonstrations, whatever number of questions and answers he may have learned by rote, knows absolutely nothing of geometry: unless he attain this point, all his labour is utterly lost; worse than lost, perhaps, if he is led to believe that he has learned something of a science, when, in truth, he has not. And the same is the case with logic, or any other science. It does not admit of such various degrees, as a knowledge of religion. Of course I am far from supposing that all who understand anything at all of logic stand on the same level; but I mean, what is surely undeniable, that one who does not embrace the fundamental principles of that, or any other science, whatever he may have taken on authority, and learned by rote, knows, properly speaking, nothing of that science. And such, I have no hesitation in saying, is the case with a considerable proportion even of those candidates who obtain testimonials, including many who gain distinction. There are some persons (probably not so many as one in ten, of such as have in other respects tolerable abilities) who are physically incapable of the degree of steady abstraction requisite for really embracing the principles of logic or of any other science, whatever pains may be taken by themselves or their teachers. But there is a much greater number to whom this is a great difficulty, though not an impossibility; and who, having, of course, a strong disinclination to such a study, look naturally to the very lowest admissible standard. And the example of such examinations in logic as must be expected in the case of men of these descriptions, tends, in combination with popular prejudice, to degrade the study altogether in the minds of the generality.”

The conclusions deducible from these important remarks of the very learned archbishop are strikingly in accordance with those of bishop Law; though the latter speaks in a tone of bitter vituperation concerning “the dull, crabbed system of Aristotle’s Logic,” and the former, in a manner the most skilful and judicious, points out the great utility of that system, when properly applied. From each of these famous masters in Israel we may learn, that both Mathematics and Logic are only *instruments*; that many youthful students regard them as an *end*, rather than as *means*; that others, who are adepts in them, seem to possess no capacity for applying them to suitable and legitimate purposes, but handle them in a manner quite as harmless as that in which an infant plays with a gilded toy; that “these *assistants*, these comparatively meagre *instruments*, ‘eat up all that is good and well-favoured’ in the sciences themselves;” “that they usurp the place of

those very sciences to which they were originally designed to be subservient, and for which station they are sufficiently qualified ;” “that these *helps for conducting an inquiry* through the whole Cyclopædia, instead of continuing to perform such useful offices, are, by the mere force of fashion, set up for a capital branch of it, and the best part of the scholar’s time spent in speculating on these same *instruments* ;” that “a very small proportion even of distinguished students ever become proficient ;” that “they have learned by rote a string of technical terms, but understand absolutely nothing whatever of the science” which has long been the chief object of their attention ; that “some persons are physically incapable of the degree of steady abstraction requisite for really embracing the principles of any science ;” and that “there is a much greater number, to whom this is a great difficulty, though not an impossibility, and who, having a strong disinclination to such a study, look naturally to the very lowest admissible standard.”

The preceding admissions are creditable to the honourable and cultivated minds of these distinguished prelates ; but the results which they severally deplore are easily accounted for on the common principles of human nature. Were an accurate and extensive knowledge of polite learning, of what is usually included in the term *Belles Lettres*, or were an acquaintance with any other science, made the general test of scholarship in our Universities, the change would not abate the evil, nor lessen the causes of complaint. In this view, much might be said in defence of those good and wise men who, at various periods of our literary history, have instituted the several tests which some may seek to alter ; but my circumscribed limits prevent me from adverting to this topic, and to others of still greater moment. Norris, however, notwithstanding the occasionally large admixture of Platonism in his lucubrations, has, with great truth of nature, described some of the reasons why all men cannot attain to true learning, and why the poetic axiom is not found to be in all cases correct :—

*Ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes  
Emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros.*

“However strong and universal is the desire of knowledge, men are generally more in love with the fame and reputation of it, than with the thing itself. But, though the generality of man be so passionately and keenly set upon the fame of being learned and knowing, yet, so little hath nature designed to gratify this ambitious humour, there are but very few that have either a genius and inclination for learning itself, or a capacity of attaining to it.—Not an INCLINATION, because there is a great variety in the speculative as well as moral inclinations of men, one being naturally disposed to this sort of study and another to that ; whereas true knowledge is of one determinate kind or nature in general, and consequently must require a certain peculiar frame and disposition of mind.—Not a CAPACITY, because the generality of mankind are known to have but indifferent intellectuals, suited to the exigencies of

common life ; whereas true knowledge must be supposed to be a thing of uncommon difficulty, and the study of it a work fit only for sublimer wits, the more elevated and awakened part of mankind. Few may succeed well in the search of what they were naturally qualified for ; and, having attained to a competency of true knowledge, such as is perfective of the understanding, they find themselves under no temptation to place it in any thing else, or to bring into credit any other sort of knowledge. But what shall we do with the others ? Are they to be persuaded, that they are not of a make for the study and attainment of learning ? You will find it tough work to convince them of that. They have but one way left, and that is, to cry up something or other for learning which they are capable of. No matter whether it deserve that name ; it is enough if they can reach it. For, those who cannot compass true riches, and yet will have the name and credit of it, are put upon the necessity of coining and counterfeiting. True learning ought to be placed in the knowledge of necessary truth, in the comprehension of those arts and sciences whose foundations are not arbitrary, but stable and immutable, and in understanding the eternal and unchangeable laws and measures of reason and consequence. He therefore is the truly learned and knowing man, who has furnished his mind with bright and clear ideas, lodged them orderly and regularly in his head, and settled the relations and consequences of one to another ; he that is able to think clearly and distinctly, (for so much a man knows as he distinctly understands, and no more,) to judge truly and solidly, and to reason dependently and consequentially. But the world does not esteem him a learned man, whose learning has cleared his understanding, who is arrived to clearness and distinctness of conception, and is a thorough master of notion and discourse. No ; it will cost great pains, great labour of mind, and anxiety of thinking, to arrive to this pitch. Nor will all the pains in the world do, unless a man be naturally made for it, unless he be of a notional complexion, and has had his head cast in a metaphysical mould : whereupon, this attainment is like to be the lot of a very few. This, therefore, must not be learning ; but something else must, that lies more within common reach, though of no real moment to the perfection of the understanding : such are contingent truths ; and yet learning is generally placed in the knowledge of these. It is reckoned a notable point of learning, to understand variety of languages. This alone gives a man a title to learning without one grain of sense. Words are purely in order to thought and sense ; and, therefore, are of no further value than as they serve as helps either to learn or to communicate the other. To affect them therefore for themselves, is to turn the means into the end. Another thing there is which passes for wonderful learning, and that is our sophistical way of disputation. I think Monsieur Gassendi, in his *Paradoxical Exercitations*, has given us a true image and representation of it, when he tells of the six eggs which the countryman ordered to be provided for the entertainment of his son,



when he returned home from the University. The father would have him boil six eggs: two for him, two for his mother, and two for himself. But the son, having an itch to show a proof of his scholastic improvement, boiled but three. When his father asked him why he had not provided six: 'Why,' says he, 'are there not here six?' *How so?* says the father, *I can see but three.* 'No!' replies the young sophister, 'is not here one?' (telling them out,) 'and is not there two? and is not there three? And do not ONE, TWO, and THREE make SIX?' *Well,* says the father, *then I will take two, and your mother shall have one, and you shall have the other three!*—And I now think all was right and as it should be. The son, for his part, gave a true specimen of his University-learning; and the father served him very well, and in his kind; that is, showed him trick for trick. As far as I could ever observe for thirteen years together, this great mystery of disputation is nothing else but a mere tossing of words backward and forward, sometimes without any meaning, which is *canting*; and sometimes with more meanings than one, which is *punning*. There are many other things [beside a knowledge of history, chronology, &c.] which the unaccountable humour of the world has turned up for learning, for which ignorance will never be the better, and which wisdom does not need. A *well-read man* signifies the very same as a *learned man*, in most men's dictionaries; and by WELL-READ they do not mean one that has read well, that has cleared and improved his understanding by his reading, but only one that has read a great deal, though perhaps he has puzzled and confounded his notions by doing so. Thus again it goes for learning, to be acquainted with men's opinions, especially of the ancients; what this or that author says, though perhaps he says nothing but what is either absurd or obviously true. It is thought learning, to know the very titles of books, and their several editions, with the time and place when and where they were printed. From this placing of learning in the knowledge of books, proceeds that ridiculous vanity of multiplying quotations, though they are used so unseasonably and impertinently that there can be no other end in them than only to show that the author has read such a book: and yet it is no such convincing evidence of that neither,—it being neither new nor difficult for a man that is resolved upon it, to quote such authors as he never read nor saw.

"Attention, or application of mind to the intelligible world, the world of truth, is a virtual mental prayer, an act of intellectual devotion to 'the Father of Lights,' and such as, if more expressly uttered and unfolded, bespeaks Him in the words of the royal suppliant: *Give me Wisdom, that sitteth by thy throne!* This is to take hold of essential truth nakedly as it is in itself; it is to fix the eye of the mind upon the Intellectual Sun, upon Him who is Substantial Truth, and the Light of the world. So a man that casts a short, careless glance upon the galaxy, sees only a confused whiteness arising from the numerous mixture of little splendours. But when the same person



**fixes** his eye with steadiness and delay of application, he begins to discern something more distinctly ; a new star ever and anon arises under his inspection, not discovered before ; and still the longer and harder he looks, the more he discerns ; till at length he has discovered as much as he can well attend to at once, and has satiated his faculty with the brightness and multitude of light. This was the method of the first inventors of arts and sciences, who made their way into the coasts of learning by mere dint of thinking ; and this is the very method that has been used by the greatest improvers of them ever since : such as BACON, BOYLE, DESCARTES, GALILEUS, MERSENNUS, DIGBY, MALEBRANCHE, POIRET, and (whom I name with particular honour and reverence) our excellent friend DR. MORE. And I dare prophesy, that, if ever any extraordinary advancement be for the future made in the world, it will be done by thinking.—Whereas purity of heart and life is another method, it is a sad as well as a true observation, that this is neglected among the generality of those few that addict themselves to the cultivation and improvement of their minds. Men *famed* for learning are oftentimes as *infamous* for living ; and many that study hard to furnish their *heads*, are yet very negligent in purifying their hearts, not considering that there is a *moral* as well as a *natural* communication between one and the other, and that they are concerned to be pure in heart and life, not only upon the common account,—in order to a happy state hereafter, but also in pursuance of their own particular way and end here.—Lastly. Whereas another method of wisdom is prayer ; I do not find, that the generality of students do at all apply themselves to this method. Pray indeed (it is to be hoped) they do for other things, which they think lie more out of their reach ; but, as for learning and knowledge, they think they can compass this well enough by their own proper industry and the help of good books, without being beholden to the assistance of Heaven.” \*

By his contemporaries Norris was charged with Quakerism, for some mystic notions which he propounded in his admirable Letter to lady Masham, the hostess of Locke, and the accomplished daughter of the immortal Cudworth. But he is not to be reprehended for those extracts which I have given in the last paragraph, on the subject of prayer ; the principle of this was conceded, and the practice of it adopted, even by some of the well-educated Deists of that and the preceding age ; though they did not always strive to unite with it the other necessary adjunct,—purity of heart and life. Let, however, no youthful student be deterred from the best exertion of his mental powers, through a few of the sweeping and austere conclusions of this author. Many of the minor pursuits of the learned which he tries to depreciate and minify, are exceedingly useful and very important ; and it is a happy circumstance for all who are concerned in the world of letters, that there is such a diversified division of intellectual labour,

\* “ Reflections upon the Conduct of human Life, with Reference to the Study of Learning and Knowledge.”

—each well-qualified man addicting himself to that peculiar branch (even though it may be deemed a recondite one) for which he either feels an inward appetency, or which appears to be assigned to him as the allotment of an All-wise Providence. Besides, this diatribe is the best moderator of its own severity, mixed as it is with much that is true; for, only he who had himself made a complete circuit through the wide field of human knowledge could write thus learnedly, in his old age, against many sciences for which, it is very evident, he had no natural appetency, but all of which are in their several orders beneficial to mankind.

Neither let any young aspirant after literary fame be disheartened, under the apprehension that he is one of those “who are physically incapable of the degree of steady abstraction requisite for really embracing any science;” for, this is a fear that has been felt in early life by some of the ablest (yet most diffident) men that ever lived. Extremely rare indeed are the great men of universal genius; but it is satisfactory to know from archbishop Whately, who is a most competent authority, that “of such as have in other respects tolerable abilities, probably not so many as *one in ten* are physically incapable” of excelling in any laudable pursuit to which they may apply their powers. Many young men are depressed in spirit, and mentally ruined, through the narrow perversity of some of those under whom it is their misfortune to be placed for the acquisition of knowledge. These shallow preceptors have one invariable standard for the admeasurement of all intellectual developements, both as to time, height, and quality; and the youth who does not come up, at the fixed time and manner, to the proposed height, is frowned upon and denounced as a blockhead. Still more unfortunate is the case, when any young person quietly sits down, without a redeeming struggle, under the belief of his own utter incompetency, as one “unto every good work reprobate,” forsaken of God, and disowned by man. But let him know that it is a peculiar gift of Heaven, not possessed by every tutor, to distinguish and appreciate the extremely varied talents of pupils. The hardy primrose, snow-drop, crocus, daisy, and cowslip are among the precocious flowers which adorn the early peep of Spring. But he is assuredly an ignorant and perverse man who, while admiring these, can hastily slight the shy violet, the long-hesitating rose, pink, or carnation, with the later-blowing lily, in the plainness of their embryo enclosures; and the best reproof to be conveyed to such an one is, to exhibit to his astonished and overpowered senses these still more fragrant and beautiful flowers, in all their maturity of blooming Summer-pride. A formal moral to this obvious (though incomplete) simile is not here required.

This brief digression from the history of the early culture of the Mathematics in this University, involves other collateral topics of great interest; for the discussion of which this well-filled volume affords no space.—EDIT.

THE HISTORY  
OF  
WALTHAM-ABBNEY IN ESSEX.  
FOUNDED BY KING HAROLD.

*Patria est ubicunque est bene ;  
Bene vixit, qui bene latuit.*

BY THOMAS FULLER,  
THE CURATE THEREOF.



TO THE  
RIGHT HONOURABLE JAMES HAY,  
EARL OF CARLISLE,  
VISCOUNT DONCASTER, BARON OF SAULEY  
AND WALTHAM.

---

I HAVE formerly in this History presumed to trouble your Honour, and now adventure the second time. Indeed, this treatise containeth the description of your large demesnes, and larger royalty and command. Should I therefore present it to any other, save yourself, it would be held as a stray indeed, (wandering out of the right way it should go in,) and so, without any thanks to me, would fall to your Lordship, as due unto you by the custom of your manor.

Your Honour's most obliged servant and chaplain,  
THOMAS FULLER.

# THE HISTORY

## OF

# WALTHAM ABBEY.

---

### I. INTRODUCTION.

#### 1. *The Author's Design.*

PROVIDENCE, by the hand of my worthy friends, having planted me for the present at Waltham-abbey, I conceive, that, in our general work of abbeys, I owe some particular description to that place of my abode. Hoping my endeavours herein may prove exemplary to others (who dwell in the sight of remarkable monasteries) to do the like, and rescue the observables of their habitations from the teeth of time and oblivion.

2—7. *Waltham, why so named. The Situation thereof. Excused from bad Air. First founded by Tovy. Falls back to the Crown. Bestowed on Earl Harold.*

Waltham is so called from the Saxon *ham*, which is a “town,” (whence the diminutive, *hamlet*,) and *weald*, or *wealt*, that is, “woody,” (whence the *weald of Kent*,) it being anciently overgrown with trees and timber. Thus *Kiriath-jearim*, or “the city of the woods,” in Palestine; *Dendros*, an island in Peloponnesus; *Sylviacum*, an ancient city in Belgia; got their names from the like woody situation. Some will have it called Waltham, *quasi Wealthie-ham*: I wish they could make their words good, in respect of the persons living therein; though, in regard of the soil itself, indeed it is rich and plentiful.

The town is seated on the east side of the river Ley, [Lea,] which not only parteth Hertfordshire from Essex, but also seven times parteth from itself; whose septemfluus stream, in coming to the town, is crossed again with so many bridges. On the one side, the town itself hath large and fruitful meadows, (whose intrinsic

value is much raised by the vicinity of London,) the grass whereof, when first gotten an head, is so sweet and luscious to cattle, that they diet them, at the first entering therein, to half an hour a-day, lest otherwise they over-eat themselves ; which some kine yearly do, and quickly die for it, notwithstanding all their keepers' care to the contrary. On the other side, a spacious forest spreads itself, where, fourteen years since, one might have seen whole herds of red and fallow deer. But these late licentious years have been such a Nimrod, such "an hunter," that all at this present are destroyed ; though I could wish this were the worst effect which our woful wars have produced.

The air of the town is condemned, by many, for over-moist and aguish, caused by the depressed situation thereof. In confutation of which censure, we produce the many aged persons in our town, —above threescore-and-ten, since my coming hither, above threescore-and-ten years of age ; so that, it seems, we are sufficiently healthful, if sufficiently thankful for the same. Sure I am, what is wanting in good air in the town is supplied in the parish, wherein as many pleasant hills and prospects are, as any place in England doth afford.

Tovy, a man of great wealth and authority, as being the king's staller, (that is, standard-bearer,) first founded this town, for the great delight which he took in the game, the place having plenty of deer. He planted only threescore-and-six in-dwellers therein.

Athelstan, his son, proved a prodigal, and quickly spent all his father's goods and great estate ; so that, by some transactions, the place returned to the crown.

Edward the Confessor bestowed Waltham, with the lands thereabouts, on Harold, his brother-in-law, who presently built and endowed therein a monastery, whereof nothing at this day is extant, save the west end, or body of the church.

### 8, 9. *The Model of the modern Church. Mortality triumphant.*

A structure of Gothic building, rather large than neat, firm than fair ; very dark, (the design of those days to raise devotion,) save that it was helped again with artificial lights ; and is observed by artists to stand the most exactly east and west of any in England. The great pillars thereof are wreathed with indentings ; which vacancies, if formerly filled up with brass, (as some confidently report,) added much to the beauty of the building. But it matters not so much their taking away the brass from the pillars, had they but left the lead on the roof, which is but meanly tiled at this day. In a word, the best commendation of the church is, that on Lord's days, generally, it is filled with a great and attentive congregation.



To the south side of the church is joined a chapel, formerly our lady's, now a school-house, and under it an arched charnel-house, the fairest that ever I saw. Here a pious fancy could make a feast to itself on those dry bones, with the meditation of mortality; where it is hard, yea, impossible, to discern the skulls of a rich from a poor—wise from a simple—noble from a mean—person. Thus all counters are alike, when put up together in the box or bag, though, in casting of account, of far different valuation.

10, 11. *A Dean and Canons founded at Waltham. Seventeen Manors confirmed to them by the Confessor.*

King Harold dedicated the monastery to the honour of a Holy Cross, found far westward, and brought hither, as they write, by miracle; whence the town hath the addition of Waltham-Holy-Cross; but the church we find, in after-ages, also dedicated to St. Laurence. His foundation was for a dean, and eleven secular black canons. Let none challenge the words of impropriety, seeing a dean, in Latin, *decanus*, hath his name from *δέκα*, “ten,” over which number he is properly to be preposed. For, nothing more common than to wean words from their infant and original sense, and by custom to extend them to a larger signification, as *dean* afterwards plainly denoted “a superior over others,” whether fewer than ten, as the six prebendaries of Rochester; or more, as the three-and-thirty of Salisbury. The dean and eleven canons were plentifully provided for, each canon having a manor, and the dean six, for his maintenance.

For, in the charter of confirmation, made by king Edward the Confessor, besides North-land in Waltham, (now called, as I take it, North-field,) wherewith the monastery was first endowed, these following lordships, with all their appurtenances, are reckoned up: 1. Passefield. 2. Walde. 3. Upminster. 4. Walthfare. 5. Suppedene. 6. Alwertowne. 7. Wodeford. 8. Lambehide. 9. Nesingan. 10. Brickindon. 11. Melnhoo. 12. Alichsea. 13. Wormeley. 14. Nichelswells. 15. Hitchche. 16. Luken-don. 17. West-Wealtham. All these the king granted unto them *oum sacha & socha, tol & team*, &c., free from all gelts [guilds] and payments, in a most full and ample manner; witness himself, Edith his queen, Stigand *archiepiscopus Dorobornensis*; count Harold, and many other bishops and lords subscribing the same charter.

12, 13. *Harold crowned, killed, and buried at Waltham.*  
*Deforming Reformers.*

Afterward Harold usurpeth the crown, but enjoyed it not a full year, killed in battle-fight by king William the Conqueror: where either of their swords, if victorious, might have done the deed, though, otherwise, both their titles twisted together could not make half a good claim to the crown. Githa, mother of Harold, and two religious men of this abbey, Osegod and Ailric, with their prayers and tears, hardly prevailed with the Conqueror (at first denying him burial, whose ambition had caused the death of so many) to have Harold's corpse (with his two brethren, Girth and Leofwin, losing their lives in the same battles) to be entombed in Waltham church, of his foundation. He was buried where now the earl of Carlisle's leaden fountain in his garden, then probably the end of the choir, or rather some eastern chapel beyond it: his tomb of plain, but rich gray marble, with what seemeth a *cross-floree* (but much descanted on with art) upon the same, supported with pillarets, one pedestal whereof I have in my house. As for his reported epitaph, I purposely omit it, not so much because barbarous, (scarce any better in that age,) but because not attested, to my apprehension, with sufficient authority.

A picture of king Harold in glass was lately to be seen in the north window of the church, till ten years since some barbarous hand beat it down, under the notion of superstition. Surely, had such ignorant persons been employed, in the days of Hezekiah, to purge the temple from the former idolatry; under the pretence thereof they would have rended off the lily-work from the pillars; and the lions, oxen, and cherubims from the bases of brass. However, there is still a place called Harold's-park in our parish, by him so denominated. Let not, therefore, the village of Harold, on the north side of Ouse, near Bedford, (properly Harewood, or Harelswood, on vulgar, groundless tradition,) contest with Waltham for this king's interment.

---

II. THE RE-FOUNDATION OF WALTHAM-ABBEY  
 BY HENRY II.

1, 2. *Waltham Canons in a sad Condition. The Industry of Robert Fuller, last Abbot of Waltham.*

ONE will easily believe, that, at the death of king Harold, Waltham-Abbey, founded by him, was in a swoon, and the canons therein much disheartened. However, they had one help, which

was this :—That Edward the Confessor was the confirmer of their foundation, whose memory was not only fresh and fair in all men's minds, (bearing a veneration to his supposed sanctity,) but also king William the Conqueror had the best of his bad titles by bequest of the crown from this Confessor. So that, in some sense, Waltham-Abbey might humbly crave kindred of king William, both deriving their best being from one and the same person.

Know, reader, that whatever hereafter I allege touching the lands and liberties of Waltham, if not otherwise attested by some author in the margin, is by me faithfully transcribed out of Waltham ledger-book, now in the possession of the Right Honourable James earl of Carlisle. This book was collected by Robert Fuller, the last abbot of Waltham ; who, though he could not keep his abbey from dissolution, did preserve the antiquities thereof from oblivion. The book (as appears by many inscriptions in the initial text-letters) was made by himself, having as happy a hand in fair and fast writing, as some of his surname since have been defective therein.

3—5. *Queen Maud gives Waltham Monks a Mill : Queen Adelisia the Tithes. King Stephen's Bounty.*

Not long after the Conquest, Waltham-Abbey found good benefactors, and considerable additions to their maintenance. For, Maud, the first queen to king Henry I. bestowed on them the mill at Waltham, which she had by exchange for Trinity Church, in London ; which I take to be part of the Trinity Priory, now called the Duke's Place.

Adelisia, second wife to king Henry I. being possessed of Waltham as part of her revenue, gave all the tithes thereof, as well of her demesnes as all tenants therein, to the canons of Waltham. Meantime, how poorly was the priest of the place provided for ! Yea, a glutton monastery in former ages makes an hungry ministry in our days. An abbey, and a parsonage unimpropriate, in the same place, are as inconsistent together, as good woods and an iron mill. Had not Waltham church lately met with a noble founder, the minister thereof must have kept more fasting-days than ever were put in the Roman Calendar.

King Stephen, though he came a wrong way to the crown, yet did all right to the monastery of Waltham, (as who generally sought the good-will of the clergy to strengthen himself,) and confirmed all their lands, profits, and privileges unto them.

6—10. *King Henry dissolves the Dean and Canons at Waltham. Augustinians substituted in their Room. Rome-Land in Waltham. Fitz-Aucher settled at Copt-Hall. Hugh Neville a bountiful Benefactor.*

King Henry II. utterly dissolved the foundation of dean and eleven canons at Waltham. The debauchedness of their lives is rendered in his charter as the occasion thereof: *Cum in eâ canonici clericique minus religiosè et æqualiter vixissent, ita quòd infamia conversationis illorum multos scandalisasset.* Whether these were really or only reputed vicious, God knows; seeing all those must be guilty whom power is pleased to pronounce so. Sure it is, king Henry outed this dean and canons, and placed an abbot and regular Augustinians in their room, increasing their number to twenty-four. And because (to use the king's own words) it was fit, "that Christ's spouse should have a new dowry," he not only confirmed to this monastery the primitive patrimony mentioned in the Confessor's charter, *cum peciis terræ*, "with many pieces of land," and tenements, which their benefactors since bestowed upon them, but also conferred the rich manors of Sewardstone and Eppings on this monastery.

The whole charter of king Henry is too long to transcribe, but some passages therein must not be omitted. First. The king had the consent of pope Alexander for the suppression of these canons; the rather moved thereunto, *quia prædictis canonicis sufficienter provisum fuit*, "because the aforesaid expelled canons had sufficient provision made for them." For, grant them never so scandalous, this was to add scandal to scandal,—to thrust them out of house and home, without any means or maintenance. Secondly. This charter presents us with the ancient liberties of Waltham church, that, *semper fuit regalis capella ex primitivâ sui fundatione, nulli archiepiscopo vel episcopo, sed tantùm ecclesiæ Romanæ et regiæ dispositioni subjecta.* And though, since Reformation, the church hath been subjected to the archbishop's jurisdiction, (as succeeding to the royal power,) and sometimes with grumbling and reluctance to the episcopal power, yet it never as yet owned an archdeacon, or appeared at his visitation.

The mentioning of the consent of pope Alexander to the suppression of Waltham dean and canons, and substituting Augustinians in their room, mindeth me of a spacious place in this town, at the entrance of the abbey, built about with houses, called *Rome-land*, as (Peter-pence were termed *Rome-scot*) at this day. It is generally believed, that the rents thereof peculiarly belonged to the church of Rome. Thus the pope would not be so bad a carver as to cut all away to others, and reserve no corner to himself.

King Richard I. (though generally not too loving to the clergy) amply confirmed his father's foundation, and gave lands to Richard Fitz-Aucher in this parish, to hold them in fee, and hereditarily of the church of Waltham-Holy-Cross. This Fitz-Aucher fixed himself at Copt-Hall, a stately house in the parish; whether so called contractedly, *quasi* Cobbing-Hall, from Cobbing, a rivulet running not far off; or from two ancient and essential turrets of that house, which are coped, and covered with lead; or from (in my mind most probable) an high and sharp hill, (thus *Copeland*, so called, in Cumberland,) whereon the house is founded.

In or about this king's reign, Hugh Neville, with the consent of Joan his wife, and John his son, bestowed the manor of Thorndon on the monastery of Waltham, of whom largely before.

11, 12. [*King Henry III. bestows a Market and a Fair.*]  
*Waltham Market.*

King Henry III. to spare court-keeping, came often and lay long at abbeys; so that Waltham (the nearest mitred abbey to London) had much of his company. Being a religious prince, great were his *desires*; but, withal necessitous, small his *deeds* in endowing churches. However, what he wanted in giving himself, he supplied in confirming the gifts of others. And, finding it the cheaper way of benefaction to give liberties than lands, he bestowed on Waltham a weekly market, and a fair, (so called *a feriando*, "from people's playing there,") to last seven days; which now is divided into two, but of shorter continuance, the one on the third day of May, the invention—the other on the fourteenth of September, the exaltation—of the cross.

We now have a market on Tuesday, but cannot boast of much trading therein. Indeed, there is plenty of flesh, but little corn, brought thither; and bread is the staff, as of a man, so of a market. Nor let us impute the thinness of chapmen in summer to husbandmen's having no leisure, as busied in tillage, hay, or harvest; or, in winter, to their having no pleasure to repair thither in so deep and dirty ways; seeing the plain truth is, no underwood can thrive near the droppings of so great an oak, the vicinity of London. The golden market in Leadenhall makes leaden markets in all the towns thereabouts.

13—16. *Broils betwixt the Abbot and the Townsmen about Commons. The Sturdiness of the Townsmen. The most guilty first accuse. The Abbot comes off Conqueror.*

In the first year that Simon was made abbot, (which by exactest proportion we collect to be about the thirtieth year of King

Henry III.) the men of Waltham came into the marsh,\* which the abbot and his convent formerly enjoyed as several to themselves, killed four mares, worth forty shillings sterling at least, and drove away all the rest. The abbot was politicly pleased, for the present, not to take notice thereof. The next year some men of Waltham went to the abbot, the Thursday before Easter, in the name of the whole village, and demanded of him to remove his mares and colts out of the marsh. This the abbot refused to do, adding withal, that if his bailiffs had placed his cattle elsewhere than they ought, they might do well to have it amended, yet so as to defer the matter till Tuesday after Easter.

On that Tuesday, Richard, brother to the king, duke of Cornwall, came to Waltham, at what time both the men and women of the town repaired to the gate of the abbey, to receive the abbot's final answer. He told them, that he could not speak with them for the present, as providing himself for a long journey into Lincolnshire, there to visit the Justices Itinerant; but, by his prior and other canons, he desired them to be patient till his return, when he would mend what was to be mended. Not satisfied therewith, and neither respecting the spiritual holiness of the abbot, nor temporal greatness of the duke, they railed at and reviled him. Then into the pasture they go; and, in driving out the abbot's mares and colts, drowned three worth twenty shillings, spoiled ten more to the value of ten marks, and beat their keepers, who resisted them, even to the shedding of blood.

But, after the abbot returned from Lincolnshire, the townsmen, fearing they should be trounced for their riot, desired a loveday, submitted themselves unto him, and proffered to pay him damage. But, next day, when the performance of these promises was expected, away went the Waltham-men, with their wives and children, to the king to London, enraging him, as much as in them lay, against the abbot, accusing him, that he would disinherit them of their right, bring up new customs, take away their pastures, and, to use their own words, "eat them up to the bones;" and that he had wounded and abused some of them, who stood defending their own rights. Which false report was believed of many, to the great disgrace of the convent of Waltham.

The abbot would not put up [with] so great a wrong; but, having episcopal power in himself, proceeded to the excommunication of the rebellious Walthamites. But the townsmen went another way to work; namely, to defend their right by the common laws of the realm. Whereupon Stephen Fitz-Bennet, Simon of the Wood,

\* MS. of Edward Stacy, written (as appears by character) one hundred and forty years since, fol. 42.

liam Theyden, and Ralph of the Bridge, in the name of all the  
 , implead the abbot for appropriating their commons to himself.  
 t, in fine, (after many cross pleadings here too long to relate,)  
 abbot so acquitted himself, that he made both his own *right*  
 d the townsmen's *riot* to appear; who, at last, at the King's  
 ench, were glad to confess that they had done evil, and were  
 nerced twenty marks to the abbot, which he not only remitted  
 nto them, but also, on their submission, assoiled them from the  
 xcommunication.

17—20. *The Suit betwixt the Abbot of Waltham and the Lord  
 of Chesthunt. A like not the same. The Suit determined.  
 Accessions to lengthen the Cause.*

The brawls betwixt the abbot and townsmen of Waltham were  
 no sooner ended, but far fiercer began betwixt the said abbot and  
 the lord of Chesthunt, on the like occasion. This Chesthunt is a  
 large parish in Hertfordshire, confining on the west of Waltham,  
 so called, saith Norden,\* *quasi castanetum*, “of chestnut-trees,”  
 though now, I believe, one hardly appears in the whole lordship.  
 In this suit,—

PLAINTIFF.—Peter duke of Savoy, the king's dear uncle, (first  
 founder, I take it, of the Savoy, in London,) on whom the king  
 conferred many lordships, and Chesthunt amongst the rest.

JUDGES.—Ralph Fitz-Nicholas; John of Lexington; Paulin  
 Peyner Seneschal; Henry of Bath; Jeremy of Caxton; Henry  
 de Bretton.

DEFENDANT.—Simon, the abbot, and the convent of Waltham.

SOLICITOR.—Adam de Alverton.

THE CASE.—The plaintiff endeavoured to prove, that the stream  
 of Ley, (called the King's-Stream,) dividing Hertfordshire from  
 Essex, ran through the town of Waltham, all the land west thereof  
 belonging to the manor of Chesthunt. This was denied by the  
 defendant; maintaining, that Small-Ley-Stream, running well-nigh  
 half a mile west of Waltham, parted the counties; all the inter-  
 jacent meadows pertained to Waltham.

Perusing the names of these the king's justices at Westminster,  
 who would not suspect but that this Henry of Bath was bishop of  
 that see? considering how many clergymen in that age were  
 employed in places of judicature. But the suspicion is causeless  
 finding none of that name in the episcopal catalogue. Others i  
 like manner may apprehend, that Bretton, here mentioned, was th  
 learned lawyer (afterwards bishop of Hereford) who wrote the bo  
*De Juribus Anglicanis*, and who flourished in the latter end of 1

\* In his short “Survey of Hertfordshire.”



reign of this king Henry III.\* But his name being John, not Henry, discovereth him a different person.

Not long after, this suit was finally determined, and Peter duke of Savoy remised and quit-claimed from him and his heirs, to the said abbot and his successors, the right and claim he had to ask in the same meadows and marshes of the said abbot. This is called in the instrument *finalis concordia*, though it proved neither “final” nor a “concord.” For, soon after, this palliate cure broke out again; and the matter was in variance and undetermined betwixt Robert the last abbot, and the lord of Chesthunt, when the abbey was dissolved.

Many accessions (besides those common prolongers of all suits, namely, the heat of men’s anger, and the bellows of instruments gaining by law) did concur to lengthen this cause:—1. The considerableness and concernment of the thing controverted, being a large and rich portion of ground. 2. The difficulty of the cause, about the channels of that river, which, Proteus-like, in several ages hath appeared in sundry forms, disguised by derivations on different occasions. 3. The greatness of the clients; Chesthunt lordship being always in the hand of some potent person, and the corporation of Waltham-Convent able to wage law with him. Hence hath this suit been as long-lived as any in England, not excepting that in Gloucestershire† betwixt the posterity of viscount Lisle, and the lord Berkeley: seeing very lately, if not at this day, there were some suits about our bounds; Waltham meadows being very rich in grass and hay, but too fruitful in contentions.

For mine own part, that wound which I cannot heal I will not widen: and, seeing I may say with the poet,—

*Non nostrum inter vos tantas componere lites;*

“No power of mine so far extends,  
As for to make both parties friends;”

I will not turn, of an impartial historian, an engaged person, who, as a neighbour, wish well to Chesthunt; as a parishioner, better to Waltham; as a Christian, best to both. And therefore so much for matter of fact, in our records and ledger-books, leaving all matters of right for others to decide.

### 21, 22. Chesthunt Nunnery founded. Copt-Hall passed to King Henry VIII.

Meantime, whilst the abbot and monks of Waltham were vexed with the men of Chesthunt, they found more favour (if public fame belies them not) from some loving women in that parish; I mean,

\* See GODWIN, in his Bishops of Hereford.

† CAMDEN, in Gloucestershire.

the holy sisters in Chesthunt nunnery, whose house (whenever founded) I find, some ten years since, thus confirmed by royal authority:—*Henricus, rex Anglie, dominus Hybernie, dux Normandie, Aquitanie, et comes Andegavis, &c. Shestrehunt moniales totam terram dom. teneant cum pertinentiis suisque canonicis de cathele, &c. quos amoveri fecimus datum apud West. xi. Aug. anno regni nostri xxiv.* But this subject begins to swell beyond the bounds intended unto it: lest, therefore, what we intended but a tract should swell to a tome, we will here descend to matters of later date.

Only be it premised, that, some years before the Dissolution, Robert, the last abbot of Waltham, passed over the fair seat of Copt-hall unto king Henry VIII. Thus, as the castor, when pursued by the hunter, to make his escape, is reported to bite off his own stones, (as the main treasure sought after,) and so saves his life by losing a limb; so this abbot politicly parted with that stately mansion, in hope thereby to preserve the rest of his revenues. However, all would not do,—so impossible it is to save what is designed to ruin; and, few years after, the abbey, with the large lands thereof, were seized on by the king, and, for some months, he alone stood possessed thereof.

---

### III. THE EXTRACTION, CHARTER, DEATH, AND ISSUE OF SIR ANTHONY DENNY, ON WHOM KING HENRY VIII. BESTOWED WALTHAM-ABBEY.

1—3. *A Lease of Waltham-Abbey given to Sir Anthony Denny. John Denny, the great Soldier in France. Edmond Denny, Baron of the Exchequer.*

AT the Dissolution, king Henry bestowed the site of this abbey, with many large and rich lands belonging thereunto, on sir Anthony Denny, for the term of thirty-one years. Let us a little inquire into his extraction and descent.

I find the name very ancient at Chesterton, in Huntingdonshire,\* where the heir-general was long since married to the worshipful and ancient family of the Bevils. It seems, a branch of the male line afterwards fixed in Hertfordshire; whereof John Denny, esq. valiantly served Henry V. in France, where he was slain, and buried, with Thomas his second son, in St. Dionys's chapel; their interment in so noble a place speaking their worthy performances. In the reign of queen Mary, a friar showed their tombs to sir

\* SPEED, or rather sir Robert Cotton, in Huntingdonshire.

Matthew Carew, together with their coats and differences. Henry, eldest son of this John Denny, begat William Denny of Chest-hunt in Hertfordshire, which William was High Sheriff of the county in the year 1480, leaving Edmond Denny to inherit his estate.

Edmond Denny was one of the barons of the Exchequer, in credit and favour with king Edward IV. and Henry VII. He married Mary, the daughter and heir of Robert Troutbeck, esq. on whom he begat Thomas Denny, from whom the Dennies in Norfolk are descended.

4—6. *Anthony Denny's high Commendations. His Epitaph made by the Lord Howard. His Issue by Dame Joan his Wife.*

Anthony Denny, second son to baron Denny, was knighted by king Henry VIII. made gentleman of his bed-chamber, privy-counsellor, and one of his executors. I cannot say he was bred any great scholar, but find him a Mæcenæ, and grand favourer of learned men. For, when the school of Sedbury [Sedberg] in the north, belonging to St. John's in Cambridge, was run to ruin, the lands thereof being sold and embezzled, sir Anthony procured the reparation of the school, and restitution of their means, firmly settling them, to prevent future alienation.\* Hear what character Mr. Ascham gives of him: *Religio, doctrina, respublica, omnes curas tuas sic occupant, ut extra has tres res nullum tempus consumas*;† “Religion, learning, commonwealth, so employ all thy cares, that besides these three things you spend no other time.” Let then the enemies (if any) of his memory abate of this character to what proportion they please, (pretending it but the orator's rhetorical hyperbole,) the very remainder thereof, which their malice must leave, will be sufficient to speak sir Anthony a worthy and meriting gentleman.

I find an excellent epitaph made on him by one the learnedest of noblemen, and noblest of learned men in his age, namely, Henry Howard, earl of Surrey, and eldest son to the duke of Norfolk, worthy the reader's perusal:—

UPON THE DEATH OF SIR ANTHONY DENNY.

DEATH and the king did, as it were, contend,  
Which of them two bare Denny greatest love:  
The king, to show his love 'gan far extend,  
Did him advance his betters far above:  
Near place, much wealth, great honour eke him gave,  
To make it known what power princes have.

\* ASCHAM *Commend. Epist.* fol. 210.

† *Idem.* fol. 208.

But when Death came with his triumphant gift,  
 From worldly cark he quit his wearied ghost  
 Free from the corps, and straight to heaven it lift.  
 Now deem that can, who did for Denny most :—  
 The king gave wealth, but fading and unsure ;  
 Death brought him bliss that ever shall endure.\*

Know, reader, that this lord made this epitaph by a poetical prolepsis ; otherwise, at the reading thereof, who would not conceive, that the author survived the subject of his poem ! Whereas indeed this Lord died (beheaded 1546) in the reign of king Henry VIII. whom sir Anthony outlived, being one of the executors of his will. Nor was it the worst piece of service he performed to his master, when (all other courtiers declining the employment) he truly acquainted him with his dying condition, to dispose of his soul for another world.

Sir Anthony died about the second of Edward VI. dame Joan his wife surviving him. Daughter she was to sir Philip Champernoon, of Modbury in Devonshire ; a lady of great beauty and parts, a favourer of the Reformed religion when the times were most dangerous. She sent eight shillings by her man, in a violet coat, to Anne Aschough,† when imprisoned in the Counter ; [Compter ;] a small sum, yet a great gift ; so hazardous it was to help any in her condition. This lady Joan bought the reversion in fee of Waltham from king Edward VI. paying three thousand and — hundred pounds for the same, purchasing therewith large privileges in Waltham-Forest, as by the letters patents doth appear. She bare two sons to sir Anthony,—Henry Denny, esq. of whom hereafter ; the second, sir Edward, who, by God's blessing, queen Elizabeth's bounty, and his own valour, achieved a fair estate in the county of Kerry in Ireland ; which at this day is (if any thing in that woful, war-wasted country can be) enjoyed by his great grandchild, Arthur Denny, esq. of Tralleigh [Tralee].

---

#### IV. THE CONDITION OF WALTHAM-CHURCH FROM THE DISSOLUTION OF THE ABBEY UNTIL THE DEATH OF KING HENRY VIII.

HAVING the perusal of the churchwardens' accounts, wherein their ancient expenses and receipts are exactly taken, fairly written, and carefully kept, I shall select thence some memorable items, to acquaint us with the general devotion of those days.

\* WEAVER'S "Funeral Monuments," page 852.

† FOX'S "Acts and Monuments," fol. 1239.

Know, then, there were six ordinary obits which the churchwardens did annually discharge ; namely, For Thomas Smith, and Joan his wife, on the sixteenth of January : For Thomas Friend, Joan and Joan his wives, on the sixteenth of February : For Robert Peest, and Joan his wife, on the tenth of April : For Thomas Towers, and Catherine his wife, the six-and-twentieth of April : For John Breges, and Agnes his wife, the one-and-thirtieth of May : For Thomas Turner, and Christian his wife, the twentieth day of December. The charge of an obit was two shillings and two pence ; and, if any be curious to have the particulars thereof, it was thus expended :—To the parish-priest, four pence ; to our lady's-priest, three pence ; to the charnel-priest, three pence ; to the two clerks, four pence ; to the children, (these I conceive choristers,) three pence ; to the sexton, two pence ; to the bellman, two pence ; for two tapers, two pence ; for oblation, two pence. O the reasonable rates at Waltham ! two shillings two pence for an obit, the price whereof in St. Paul's in London was forty shillings ! For (forsooth) the higher the church, the holier the service, the dearer the price, though he had given too much that had given but thanks for such vanities.

To defray the expenses of these obits, the parties prayed for, or their executors, left lands, houses, or stock, to the churchwardens. Thomas Smith bequeathed a tenement in the cornmarket, and others gave lands in Upshire, called Paternoster-Hills ; others, ground elsewhere, besides a stock of eighteen cows, which the wardens let out yearly to farm for eighteen shillings, making up their yearly accounts at the feast of Michael the archangel, out of which we have excerpted the following remarkable particulars.

*Anno 1542, the Thirty-Fourth of Henry VIII.*

“ *Imprimis.* For watching the sepulchre, a groat.”—This constantly returns in every yearly account ; though what meant thereby, I know not. I could suspect some ceremony on Easter-eve, in imitation of the soldiers' watching Christ's grave ; but am loath to charge that age with more superstition than it was clearly guilty of.

“ *Item,* Paid to the ringers at the coming of the king's Grace, six pence.”—Yet Waltham bells told no tales every time king Henry came hither, having a small house in Rome-land, to which he is said oft privately to retire, for his pleasure.

“ *Item,* Paid unto two *men of law* for their counsel about the church-leases, six shillings eight pence.”

“ *Item,* Paid the attorney for his fee, twenty pence.”

“ *Item,* Paid for ringing at the prince's coming, a penny.”

*Anno 1543, the Thirty-Fifth of Henry VIII.*

“*Imprimis*. Received of the executors of sir Robert Fuller, given by the said sir Robert to the church, ten pounds.”—How is this man degraded from “the Right Honourable the Lord Abbot of Waltham, (the last in that place,) to become a poor sir Robert, the title of the meanest priest in that age. Yet such his charity in his poverty, that, besides this legacy, he bequeathed to the church a chalice, silver and gilt, which they afterwards sold for seven pounds.\*

*Anno 1544, the Thirty-Sixth of Henry VIII.*

“*Imprimis*. Received of Adam Tanner the overplus of the money which was gathered for the purchase of the bells, two pound four shillings and eleven pence.”—It seems, the king’s officers sold, and the parish then purchased, the five bells, being great and tunable, (who, as they gave bountifully, so I presume they bought reasonably,) and the surplusage of the money was delivered.

“*Item*, Received of Richard Tanner, for eight stoles, three shillings.”—A stole was a vestment which the priest used. Surely these were much worn, and very rags of popery, as sold for four pence half-penny a-piece. It seems, the churchwardens were not so charitable to give away—nor so superstitious to burn—but so thrifty as to make profit by sale of—these decayed vestments.

“*Item*, Paid for mending the hand-bell, two pence.”—This was not fixed, as the rest, in any place of church or steeple, but (being a diminutive of the saints’-bell) was carried in the sexton’s hands at the circumgestion of the sacrament, the visitation of the sick, and such like occasions.

“*Item*, Paid to Philip Wright, carpenter, for making a frame in the bellfrey, eighteen shillings four pence.”—The bells, being bought by the parishioners, were taken down out of the decayed steeple; and we shall afterwards see what became thereof. Meantime, a timber-frame was made, which the aged of the last generation easily remembered, in the south-east end of the churchyard, where now two yew-trees stand, and a shift made for some years to hang the bells thereon.

*Anno 1546, the Thirty-Eighth of Henry VIII.*

“*Item*, For clasps to hold up the banners in the body of the church, eight pence.”—By these, I understand, not *pennons* with *arms* hanging over the graves of interred gentlemen, but, rather, some superstitious *streamers*, usually carried about in procession.

\* The Churchwardens’ Account, anno 1556.

“*Item*, Paid to John Boston for mending the organs, twentie pence.”

---

## V. THE STATE OF WALTHAM-CHURCH DURING THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD VI.

“OLD things are passed away, behold, all things now are become new!” Superstition by degrees being banished out of the church, we hear no more of prayers and masses for the dead. Every obit now had its own obit, and fully expired; the lands formerly given thereunto being employed to more charitable uses. But let us select some particulars of the churchwardens’ accounts in this king’s days.

*Anno 1549, the Third of Edward VI.*

“*Imprimis*. Sold the silver plate which was on the desk in the chancel, [?] weighing five ounces, for twenty-five shillings.”—Guess the gallantry of our church by this, (presuming all the rest in proportionable equipage,) when the desk, whereon the priest read, was inlaid with plate of silver.

“*Item*, Sold a rod of iron, which the curtain run upon before the rood, nine pence.”—The rood was an image of Christ on the cross, made generally of wood, and erected in a loft for that purpose, just over the passage out of the church into the chancel. And wot you what spiritual mystery was couched in this position thereof? The church (forsooth) typified the church militant, the chancel represents the church triumphant; and all who will pass out of the former into the latter, must go under the rood-loft; that is, carry the cross, and be acquainted with affliction. I add this the rather, because Harpsfield,\* that great scholar, who might be presumed knowing in his own art of superstition, confesseth himself ignorant of the reason of the rood-situation.

“*Item*, Sold so much wax as amounted to twenty-six shillings.”—So thrifty the wardens, that they bought not candles and tapers ready made, but bought the wax at the best hand, and paid poor people for the making of them. Now they sold their magazine of wax as useless. Under the Reformation, more light and fewer candles.

“*Item*, Paid for half of the book called *Paraphrase*, five shillings.”—By the seventh injunction of king Edward, each parish was to procure “the Paraphrase of Erasmus,” namely, the first part thereof on the Gospels, and the same to be set up in some convenient place in the church.

\* Fox’s “Acts and Monuments,” in the examination of Thomas Hawks, page 1590.



“*Item*, Spent in the visitation at Chelmsford, amongst the wardens and other honest men, fourteen shillings four pence.”—A round sum, I assure you, in those days. This was the first visitation (kept by Nicholas Ridley, newly bishop of London) whereat Waltham-wardens ever appeared out of their own town, whose abbot formerly had episcopal jurisdiction.

*Anno 1551, the Fifth of Edward VI.*

“*Imprimis*. Received for a knell of a servant to the lady Mary her Grace, ten pence.”—Copt Hall in this parish being then in the Crown, the lady (afterwards queen) Mary came thither sometimes, to take the air probably; during whose residence there, this her servant died.

“*Item*, Lost forty-six shillings by reason of the fall of money by proclamation.”—King Henry much debased the English coin, to his own gain and the land’s loss, (if sovereigns may be said to get by the damage of their subjects,) yet all would not do to pay his debts. His son Edward endeavoured to reduce the coin to its true standard, decrying bad money by his proclamation, to the intrinsic value thereof. But, prevented by death, he effected not this difficult design; (adultery in men, and adulterateness in money, both hardly reclaimed;) which was afterwards completed by the care of queen Elizabeth.

“*Item*, Received for two hundred seventy-one ounces of plate, sold at several times, for the best advantage, sixty-seven pound fourteen shillings and nine pence.”—Now was the brotherhood in the church dissolved, consisting as formerly of three priests, three choristers, and two sextons; and the rich plate belonging to them was sold for the good of the parish. It may seem strange the king’s commissioners, deputed for that purpose, seized not on it, from whose hands Waltham found some favour, (befriended by the lord Rich, their countryman,) the rather because of their intentions to build their decayed steeple.

---

## VI. CHURCH-ALTERATIONS IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN MARY.

“New lady new laws.” Now strange the metamorphosis in Waltham. Condemn not this our cosmography, or description of a country-town, as too low and narrow a subject; seeing, in some sort, the History of Waltham-church is the Church-History of England,—all parishes in that age being infected alike with super-

stitution. Nor intend I hereby to renew the memory of idolatry, but to revive our gratitude to God for the abolishing thereof, whose numerous trinkets here ensue.

*Anno 1554, Mariæ primo.*

“*Imprimis.* For a cross with a foot, copper and gilt, twentie-five shillings.”

“*Item,* For a cross-staff, copper and gilt, nine shillings and four pence.”

“*Item,* For a pax, copper and gilt, five shillings.”—“Greet one another,” saith St. Paul, “with an holy kiss,” 1 Cor. xvi. 20; on which words of the apostle the pax had its original. This ceremony, performed in the primitive times and eastern countries, was afterwards (to prevent wantonness, and to make the more expedition) commuted into a new custom, namely, a piece of wood or metal (with Christ’s picture thereon) was made, and solemnly tendered to all people to kiss. This was called the *pax*, or “peace,” to show the unity and amity of all there assembled, who, though not immediately, by the proxy of the pax, kissed one another.

“*Item,* For a pair of censers, copper and gilt, nine shillings and eight pence.”—These were pots, in the which frankincense was burned, perfuming the church during divine service.

“*Item,* For a stock of brass for the holy-water, seven shillings.”—Which, by the canon, must be of marble, or metal, and in no case of brick,\* lest the sacred liquor be sucked up by the sponginess thereof.

“*Item,* For a chrismatory of pewter, three shillings four pence.”—This was a vessel in which the consecrated oil, used in baptism, confirmation, and extreme unction, was deposited.

“*Item,* For a yard of silver sarcenet for a cloth for the sacrament, seven shillings eight pence.”—Here some silkman or mercer must satisfy us what this was. The price seems too low for sarcenet inwoven with silver, and too high for plain sarcenet of a silver colour.

“*Item,* For a pix of pewter, two shillings.”—This was a box wherein the host, or consecrated wafer, was put and preserved.

“*Item,* For Mary and John, that stand in the rood-loft, twentie-six shillings eight pence.”—“Christ on the cross saw his mother, and the disciple whom he loved standing by,” John xix. 26, &c. In apish imitation whereof the rood, when perfectly made with all the appurtenances thereof, was attended with these two images.

“*Item,* For washing eleven aubes and as many head-clothes, six

\* DURANTUS, *De Ritibus Eccles.* num. 6, page 173.

pence.”—An aube, or albe, was a priest’s garment of white linen down to their feet, girded about his middle. The thin matter denoted *simplicity*; colour, *purity*; length, (deep divinity! \*) *perseverance*; and the cincture thereof signified *the person* wearing it *prompt and prepared for God’s service*. Their head-clothes were like our serjeants’ coifs, but close, and not turned up.

“*Item*, For watching the sepulchre, eight pence.”—Thus the price of that service (but a groat in king Henry’s days) was doubled. However, though popery was restored to its kind, yet was it not re-estimated in its former degree, in the short reign of queen Mary. For we find no mention of the former six obits anniversarily performed; the lands for whose maintenance were alienated in the reign of king Edward, and the vicar of the parish not so charitable as to celebrate these obits gratis, without any reward for the same.

“*Item*, For a proccessioner, and a manual, twenty pence.”

“*Item*, For a corporas-cloth, twelve pence.”—This was a linen cloth laid over or under the consecrated host.

“*Item*, To the apparitor, for the bishop’s book of articles at the visitation, six pence.”—This bishop was bloody Bonner, that corpulent tyrant, full (as one said) of guts and empty of bowels; who visited his diocess before it was sick, and made it sick with his visitation. His articles were in number thirty-seven, and John Bale wrote a book against them.† The bishop’s chief care herein was the setting up of complete roods, commonly called (but when without his ear-reach) “Bonner’s Block-Almighty.” If any refused to provide such blocks for him, let them expect he would procure faggots for them.

#### *Anno 1556, Mariæ tertio.*

“*Imprimis*. For coles to undermine a piece of the steeple which stood after the first fall, two shillings.”—This steeple formerly stood in the middle (now east end) of the church; and, being ruined past possibility of repair, fell down of itself, only a remaining part was blown up by underminers. How quickly can a few destroy what required the age and industry of many in long time to raise and advance!

It soundeth not a little to the praise of this parish, that, neither burdensome nor beholding to the vicinage for a collection, they rebuilt the steeple at the west end of the church on their own proper cost, enabled thereunto, partly by their stock in the church-box, arising from the sale (as is aforesaid) of the goods of the brotherhood, and partly by the voluntary contribution of the parishioners.

\* DURANTUS, *De Ritibus Eccles.* num. 9, page 316.  
 † Fox’s “Acts and Monuments,” page 1474.

† Fox’s “Acts and

This tower-steeple is eighty-six feet high from the foundation to the battlements, each foot whereof (besides the materials pre-provided) costing thirty-three shillings four pence the building.\* Three years passed from the founding to the finishing thereof, (every year's work discernible by the discolouration of the stones,) and the parish was forced, for the perfecting of the building, to sell their bells, hanging before in a wooden frame in the churchyard; so that Waltham, which formerly had steeple-less bells, now had for some years a bell-less steeple.

---

## VII. THE CONDITION OF THE CHURCH FROM THE BEGINNING OF QUEEN ELIZABETH TO THIS DAY.

IN eleven full years, namely, from the last of king Henry VIII. *anno* 1547, till the first of queen Elizabeth, 1558, this church found four changes in religion; papist, and protestant; papist, and protestant again. The last turn will appear by the wardens' following accounts.

### 1. *Anno* 1558, *Elizabethæ primo*.

“*Imprimis*. For the taking down of the rood-loft, three shillings two pence.”—If then, there living and able, I hope I should have lent an helping hand to so good a work, as now I bestow my prayers, that the like may never in England be set up again.

“*Item*, Received for a suite of vestments, being of blew velvet, and another suite of damask, and an altar-cloth, four pound.”

“*Item*, For three corporasses, whereof two white silk, and one blew velvet, two pound thirteen shillings four pence.”

“*Item*, For two suits of vestments, and an altar-cloth, three pound.”—Now was the superstitious wardrobe dispersed, and that (no doubt) sold for shillings which cost pounds. They were beheld as the garments spotted with sin, and therefore the less pity to part with them. But see what followeth.

### 2. *Anno* 1562, *Elizabethæ quinto*.

“*Item*, For a cloth of buckeram for the communion-table, and the making, four shillings.”—Having sold so much, could they not afford a better carpet? Is there no mean betwixt painting a face, and not washing it? He must have a fixed aim and strong hand,

\* The thirty-three feet on the top (difficulty and danger of climbing made it the dearer) cost forty shillings a foot, as appeareth by the churchwardens' accounts, *anno* 1563.

who hits decency, and misseth gaudiness and sluttury. But there is a generation of people who over-do, in the spirit of opposition : such conceive that a *trestle* is good enough for God's table ; and such a table, covcring enough for itself.

“ *Item*, For lattices for the church-windows, fifteen shillings.”—Fain would I, for the credit of our church, by *lattices* understand “casements,” if the word would bear it. Yet surely it was not for covetousness wholly to spare glazing, but thrift to preserve the glass, that these lattices did fence them on the outside.

“ *Item*, Paid for a bay nagge, given to Mr. Henry Denny for the abby wall, three pound seventeen shillings.”—This nag was rather a thankful acknowledgment of Mr. Denny's propriety, than a just valuation of what the parish received from him, for it followeth,—

“ *Item*, To labourers which did undermine the said wall, forty-five shillings nine pence.”—What then may the materials of that wall be presumed worth in themselves ? I conceive this was a building which ranged east beyond the old steeple, the demolishing whereof brought much profit to the parish, whose wardens for some years drave a great trade in the sale of lead, stone, and timber, all devoured in the roofing, flooring, and finishing of their steeple.

### 3. Anno 1563, *Elizabethæ sexto*.

“ *Imprimis*. For an old house in the old market-place, thirteen pound six shillings eight pence.”—This tenement, low-rented, yielded annually nine shillings. Now the parish sold it, and another house in West-street, outright ; letting leases also of their other church-lands for twenty-one years. Such bargains made a feast for the present age, and a famine for posterity.

“ *Item*, For the old timber in the little vestiary of St. George's chappel, fifteen shillings.”—In vain have I inquired for the situation hereof, long since demolished ; and no wonder if St. George's chapel cannot be found, when St. George himself is affirmed by some as one never existent in *rerum naturâ*.\*

“ *Item*, Received of Mr. Denny, for one cope of cloth of gold, three pound six shillings eight pence.”

“ *Item*, For two altar-cloaths of velvet and silk, two pound.”—It seemeth the parish did not part with all their gallantry at once, but made several stakes thereof, and parcelled them out as their necessities did require.

“ *Item*, Received of Mr. Tamworth twenty loads of timber ready hewed, which he gave to the parish.”—This gentleman, by his

\* PHILIPPUS MELANCTHON in *Apologia*, Articulu 21, Confessionis Augustanæ.

bounty to the public, seems better known to God than to me, having neither heard nor read of any of his name living in or near to Waltham.

“*Item*, For taking down the stairs in the abby, seven shillings eight pence.”—This was part of the nag-purchase, whereby we collect, that a large structure was by this bargain conveyed to the parish.

“*Item*, For taking down the lead from the charnel-house, and covering the steeple, eighteen shillings.”—The steeple was conceived above the charnel-house as in height so in honour. Wherefore now the lead taken from it was translated to the covering of the steeple.\* Call this removing of this metal from one part of the church to another, only the borrowing of St. Peter to lend to St. Paul.

“*Item*, For the archdeacon’s man coming for a record of all the inhabitants of the parish, four pence.”—I know not on what canon this was founded. It may be, her majesty in those dangerous times desired (not out of pride, but necessary policy) to know the number of her subjects, and might enjoin the archdeacons, in their respective visitations, to make this inquiry.

4, 5. *High Time to knock off. James Earl of Carlisle present Owner of Waltham.*

But day begins to dawn; and the light of our age to appear, matters coming within the memory of many alive. We will therefore break off; Waltham, since, affording no peculiar observables; only will add, that sir Edward (grandchild to sir Anthony) Denny was created, by king James, baron of Waltham,† and since made, by king Charles, earl of Norwich: a noble person, who settled on the curate of Waltham (to whom before a bare stipend of eight pounds did belong) one hundred pounds *per annum*, with some other considerable accommodations, tying good land for the true performance thereof.

The abbey is now the inheritance of this earl’s grandchild; (by Honora his daughter,) James Hay, earl of Carlisle, who married Margaret, daughter to Francis, earl of Bedford, by whom as yet he hath no issue; for the continuance of whose happiness my prayers shall never be wanting.

6—8. *Nicholas the most eminent Abbot of Waltham. John de Waltham. Roger Waltham a learned Writer.*

The reader may justly expect from me a catalogue of all the abbots of this monastery. But to do it *falsely*, I dare not; *lamely*,

\* Which is now but tiled.

† CAMDEN’S *Britannia*, in Essex.

I would not ; *perfectly*, I cannot ; and therefore must crave to be excused. Only let me observe, that Nicholas abbot of Waltham was most triumphant in power of any in his place. He flourished in the reign of king Richard II. and was one of the fourteen commissioners, chosen by Parliament, to examine the miscarriages in that king's reign since the death of his grandfather.\*

Amongst the natives of Waltham, for statesmen John de Waltham bears away the bell. He was Keeper of the Privy Seal in the reign of king Richard II. being the third in number chosen amongst the fourteen commissioners aforesaid, empowered to examine all misdemeanours of state.† And now was not Waltham highly honoured with more than a single share, when, amongst those fourteen, two were her gremials, the fore-named Nicholas living in Waltham, and this John having his name thence, because birth therein ?

But amongst scholars in our town, Roger Waltham must not be forgotten, canon of St. Paul's in London, and a great favourite to Fulk Basset, bishop thereof. He wrote many learned books, whereof two especially (one called *Compendium Morale*, the other, *Imagines Oratorum*) commend his parts and pains to posterity.‡

9, 10. *Hugh Neville buried in Waltham ; and also Robert Passellew.*

Pass we from those who were born, to eminent persons buried, therein. Here we first meet with Hugh Neville, a minion of king Richard I. He was interred in Waltham church, saith my author,§ *in nobili sarcophago marmoreo et insculpto*, “in a noble coffin of marble engraved.” If a coffin be called *sarcophagus*, (from consuming the corpse,) surely sacrilege may be named *sarcophagophagus*, which at this day hath devoured that coffin, and all belonging thereunto.

We spoil all, if we forget Robert Passellew, who was *dominus fac totum* in the middle—and *fac nihil* towards the end—of the reign of Henry III. Some parasites extolled him by allusion to his name, *pass-le-eau*, (that is, “passing the pure water,”) the wits of those days thus descanting upon him :—

*Est aqua lenis, et est aqua dulcis, et est aqua clara,  
Tu præcellis aquam, nam leni lenior es tu,  
Dulci dulcior es tu, clara clarior es tu ;  
Mente quidem lenis, re dulcis, sanguine clarus. ||*

\* HEN. DE KNIGHTON, *De Erentibus Angl.* lib. v. page 2687.  
page 2685.

† BALE, *De Script. Brit.* cent. iv. page 302.

§ MATTHEW PARIS, *in anno* 1222, page 315.

|| Collection of Mr. Camden's MSS. in sir Thomas Cotton's library.



But such who flattered him the fastest whilst in favour, mocked him the most in misery; and at last he died in his own house in Waltham, and was buried in the abbey-church therein.\*

11, 12. *A Heap of Difficulties cast together. Queries on Queries.*

And now, because we have so often cited Matthew Paris, I never met with more difficulties in six lines, than what I find in him; which, because nearly relating to this present subject, I thought fit to exemplify:—*Eodemque anno, videlicet in crastino Sancti Michaëlis dedicata est ecclesia conventualis canonicorum de Waltham, ab episcopo Norwicensi Willielmo, solemniter valdè, assistantibus aliis plurimis episcopis, prælatis, et magnatibus venerabilibus, statim post dedicationem ecclesiæ Sancti Pauli Londinensis, ut peregrinantes hinc indè indistanter remearent.*—MATTHEW PARIS, in anno 1242, p. 595. “And in the same year, namely, the morrow after St. Michael’s day, the conventual church of the canons at Waltham was dedicated by William bishop of Norwich very solemnly, many other bishops, prelates, and venerable peers assisting him, presently after the dedication of St. Paul’s in London; that pilgrims and travellers up and down might indistantly return.” It is clear, our church of Waltham-Abbey is intended herein, England affording no other conventual church.†

This being granted, 1. How comes Waltham church, built by Harold two hundred years before, now to be first dedicated; that age accounting it as faulty and fatal to defer the consecration of churches, as the christening of children? 2. What made the bishop of Norwich to meddle therewith? an office more proper for the bishop of London to perform, Waltham being (though not under) in his jurisdiction. 3. What is meant by the barbarous word *indistanter*? and what benefit accrued to travellers thereby? I will not so much as conjecture, as unwilling to draw my bow where I despair to hit the mark, but leave all to the judgment of others. But I grow tedious, and will therefore conclude.

13—15. *King Charles’s last Coming to Waltham. Conditionally granteth the Repairing of the Church; but it miscarrieth.*

Anno 1641, king Charles came the last time to Waltham, and went, as he was wont where any thing remarkable, to see the church, the earl of Carlisle attending him. His majesty told him, that he divided his cathedral churches, as he did his royal ships, into three ranks, accounting St. Paul’s in London, York, Lincoln, Winchester, &c. of the first form; Chichester, Lichfield, &c. of the

\* MATTHEW PARIS, anno 1252.

† See SPEED’S “Catalogue of Religious Houses.”

second; the Welch cathedrals of the third, with which Waltham church may be well compared, especially if the roof thereof was taken lower and leaded.


The earl moved his majesty, that, seeing this ancient church (founded by king Harold his predecessor) was fallen into such decay that the repair was too heavy for the parish, he would be pleased to grant a moderate toll of cattle coming over the bridge, (with their great drifts\* doing much damage to the highways,) and therewith both the town might be paved, and the church repaired. The king graciously granted it, provided it were done with the privity and consent of a great prelate, (not so safe to be named as easy to be guessed,) with whom he consulted in all church-matters.

But when the foresaid prelate was informed, that the earl had applied to his majesty before addresses to himself, he dashed the design; so that poor Waltham church must still be contented with their weak walls, and worse roof, till providence procure her some better benefactors. As for the arms of Waltham-Abbey, being loath to set them alone, I have joined them in the following draught, with the arms of the other mitred abbeyes, as far as my industry could recover them.†

SOLI DEO GLORIA.

\* Modern usage prefers "droves," though both words are derived from the verb "to drive."—EDIT.

† The subjoined is one of the two "Seals of Arms" which Fuller has given to Waltham; the other appears as No. 14, in vol. II. page 329 of his "Church History."—EDIT.



**THE APPEAL**  
**OF**  
**INJURED INNOCENCE,**  
**UNTO**  
**THE RELIGIOUS, LEARNED, AND INGENUOUS READER.**  
**IN**  
**A CONTROVERSY BETWIXT**  
**THE ANIMADVERTOR—DR. PETER HEYLIN,**  
**AND**  
**THE AUTHOR—THOMAS FULLER.**

**“ See how he seeketh a quarrel against me.”—1. Kings v. 7.**

***Responsum non dictum est, quia laesi prior.*—TERENTIUS in *Eunucho*.**



TO THE  
RIGHT HONOURABLE GEORGE BERKELEY,  
LORD BERKELEY,  
MOUBRAY, SEGRAVE, AND BRUCE,

MY MOST BOUNTIFUL AND MOST EXEMPLARY PATRON.

---

SIR,

MY Church-History was so far from prostituting herself to mercenary embraces, she did not at all espouse any particular interest, but kept herself a Virgin.

However, a dragon is risen up, with much fierceness and fury, threatening this my virgin's destruction.

Your name is GEORGE, and for you it is as easy as honourable to protect her from violence.

If any material falsehood or forgery be found in my book, let "Liar" be branded in my face. But, O! suffer not my "Injured Innocence" to be overborne in such things, which I have truly, clearly, and warily written.

Thus shall you encourage me (leaving off such controversial deviations from my calling) to preach and to perform in my ministerial function somewhat worthy of the honour to be

Your Lordship's most obliged  
servant and chaplain,  
THOMAS FULLER.

CRANFORD MOAT-HOUSE,  
*March the 21st.*

THE APPEAL  
OF  
INJURED INNOCENCE.

---

PART I.

INTRODUCTION.

CONTAINING

FULLER'S INTRODUCTION, FOURTEEN CHAPTERS : HIS ANSWER TO DR. HEYLIN'S TITLE-PAGE TO THE "GENERAL PREFACE," TO THE "NECESSARY INTRODUCTION," AND TO "THE ANIMADVERSIONS ON BOOK I. OF THE CHURCH-HISTORY OF BRITAIN."

CHAPTER I.

*That it is impossible for the Pen of any Historians, writing in (as ours) a divided Age, to please all Parties, and how easy it is to cavil at any Author.*

SUCH as lived after the flood, and before the confusion of tongues, were happy in this particular,—that they did hear to understand, and speak to be understood, with all persons in their generation. Not such their felicity who lived after the confusion of languages at the Tower of Babel, when the eloquence of the best was but barbarism to all, save a few folk of his own family.

Happy those English historians who wrote some sixty years since, before our civil distempers were born or conceived ; at leastwise, before there were house-burnings (though some heart-burnings) amongst us ; I mean, before men's latent animosities broke out into open hostility : seeing then there was a general right understanding betwixt all of the nation.

But, alas ! such as wrote in or since our civil wars are seldom apprehended truly and candidly, save of such of their own persua-

sion; whilst others *do not* (or what is worse, *will not*) understand them aright: and no wonder if speeches be not rendered according to the true intent of the speaker, when prejudice is the interpreter thereof.

This I foresaw when I entered upon my Church-History; but comforted myself with the counsel of Erasmus: *Si non possis placere omnibus, placeto optimis*; "If thou canst not please all, please the best." In order whereunto, I took up to myself this resolution, to steer my course betwixt the two rocks of adulation and irritation; though it seems I have run upon both, if the Animadvertor may be believed; whereof hereafter.

As it is impossible in distracted times to please all, so is it easy for any at any time to cavil at the best performance. A pigmy is giant enough for this purpose. Now cavils may be reduced to these two heads:—Cavils without cause; cavils without measure.

CAUSELESS CAVILS are such as the caviller himself doth create, without any ground for the same. Such find a knot in a bulrush, because they themselves before had tied it therein; and may be compared to beggars, who breed vermin in their own bodies, and then blow them on the clothes of others.

CAVILS WITHOUT MEASURE are, when the anger and bitterness of the caviller exceedeth due proportion, and the demerit of the fault; as when he maketh *memory*- to be *judgment*-mistakes; *casual* to be *voluntary* errors, the *printer's* to be the *author's* faults; and then brags every foil to be a fall, and triumpheth at the rout of a small party as at the defeat of the whole army. This distinction is here premised, whercof hereafter we shall make use as we see just occasion.

---

## CHAPTER II.

*Why the Author desired and hoped never to come under the Pen of the Animadvertor in a controversial Difference.*

IT was ever my desire and care, if it were possible, not to fall under the pen of the Animadvertor; having several reasons thereof to myself, which now I publicly profess:—

1. I knew him a man of able parts and learning. God sanctify both to his glory and the church's good!

2. Of an eager spirit, with him of whom it was said, *Quicquid voluit, valde voluit*.

3. Of a tart and smart style, endeavouring to down with all which stood betwixt him and his opinion.



4. Not over-dutiful in his language to the fathers of the church, (what then may children expect from him?) if contrary in judgment to him.

Lastly and chiefly. One, the edge of whose keenness is not taken off by the death of his adversary; witness his writing against the archbishops of York and Armagh.

The fable tells us that the tanner was the worst of all masters to his cattle, as who would not only load them soundly whilst living, but tan their hides when dead; and none could blame one if unwilling to exasperate such a pen, which, if surviving, would prosecute his adversary into his grave. The premises made me, though not servilely fearful, (which, I praise God, I am not of any writer,) yet generally cautious not to give him any personal provocation, knowing that though both our pens were long, the world was wide enough for them without crossing each other.

As I desired, so I partly hoped, that my Church-History would escape the Animadvertor. First. Because a gentleman came to me, (sent from him, as I supposed,) informing me, "That had not Dr. Heylin been visited with blindness, he had been upon my bones before." Then I desired him to return this answer: "That, as I was sorry for the sad cause, the doctor's blindness; I was glad of the joyful effect, my own quiet." Not hearing any more for many months after, I conceived myself secure from any wind in that corner.

It increased my confidence, because I conceived Dr. Heylin neither out of charity or policy would write against one who had been his fellow-servant to—and sufferer for—the same lord and master, king Charles; for whose cause I lost none of the worst livings, and one of the best prebends, in England. Only thus happy I was in my very unhappiness,—to *leave* what *was taken away* from the rest of my brethren.

In a word, seeing no birds or beasts of prey (except sharp-set indeed) will feed on his own kind, I concluded Dr. Heylin would not write against me, who conceived myself to be one of his own party.

But, it seems, I reckoned without my host, and now am called to a rear-account. I cannot say with Job, "The thing that I feared"—but, The thing that I feared not—"is fallen upon me."

However, I conceived myself bound in duty to David's command, "Not only to seek peace, but to pursue it;" Psalm xxxiv. 14; though in some sort it fled away from me, being now informed that the doctor was writing against me; wherefore, finding him in Fleet-street, and following him at his heels to his chamber, (at a stationer's house over against St. Dunstan's church,) I sent up my

name to him by a servant of the house, desiring to speak a few words with him. The messenger went to him, and returned me this answer: "That the doctor was very busy, and could not be spoken with." Thus, my treaty for peace taking no effect, I armed myself with patience, and quietly expected the coming-forth of his book against me.

---

### CHAPTER III.

*That, after serious Debate, the Author found himself necessitated to make this "Appeal" in his own just Vindication.*

HAVING perused the books of the Animadvertor against me, it bare a strong debate within me, whether I should pass it over in silence, or return an answer unto him; and arguments on both sides presented themselves unto me.

Silence seemed best, because I lacked leisure solemnly to confute his "Animadversions," having at this time so much and various employment: the cow was well stocked with milk, thus praised by the poet: \*

*Bis venit ad mulctrum, binos alit ubere fœtus.*

"She suckles two, yet doth not fall  
Twice a-day to come to th' pail."

But I justly feared, who twice a Lord's-day do come to the pulpit, (God knows my heart, I speak it not to ostentation,) that I could not suckle my parish and the press, without starving or short-feeding of one: whereas the Animadvertor, in his retired life, gives no other milk than following his own private studies.

Secondly. I suggested to myself, that the second blow makes the fray; and should I rejoin, probably it would engage me in an endless contest, with which my declining age could ill comport. I remembered the man who moved in chancery for a *gelt*-order, which should beget no more; but knew not when any such *eunuch*-answer should pass betwixt us, to put a period to the controversy.

Lastly. Our Saviour's counsel came into my mind: "Resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on the right side, turn to him the other also," Matt. v. 39. And although some divines make this precept but temporary, as a swaddling-cloth to the church, whilst in the infancy thereof, under persecution; yet others make it always obligatory, and of perpetual continuance.

On the other side, the distinction came seasonably to my remembrance, of a man's *righting* and *revenging* himself; the latter

\* VIRGILII *Eclog.* lii. 30.

belongs to God alone, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay it;" Rom. xii. 19; the former men may—and in some cases must—do, in their own fair defence, without breach of our Saviour's precept lately alleged.

I called also to mind, how, in our common law, mutes at the bar, who would not plead to the indictment, are adjudged *GUILTY*; and therefore justly suspected I should, from my silence, be concluded *CAST* in the court of religion and learning, for such faults and errors as the Animadvertor hath charged on me.

But most of all it moved me, that ministers of God's word and sacraments ought to vindicate their credits, that so they may be the more effectual factors for God's glory in their vocation. When our Saviour went about to heal the man's withered hand on the Sabbath-day, "Is it lawful," said he, "to save life, or to kill?" Mark iii. 4. Where I observed, that our Saviour accounted *not healing* to be *hurting*; yea, *not curing* to be *killing*, in that person who had ability and opportunity to do it. And by the same proportion, *not plastering* is *killing* of one's wounded credit; and so, consequently, I should be *felo de se*, and by my sinful silence be the wilful murderer of my own reputation.

These last reasons did preponderate with me; and I resolved on two things: To return a plain, full, and speedy answer: and to refrain from all railing, which is a sick wit, if not the sickness of wit; and though, perchance, I may have something *tart* to quicken the appetite of the reader, yet nothing *bitter* against the credit of the Animadvertor. This my "Answer" I have here intituled, "The Appeal unto the Religious, Learned, and Ingenuous."

But before I close with the Animadvertor, *cominus*, "hand to hand;" let us first, *eminus*, try it "at distance," and entertain the reader (to his profit and pleasure, I hope) with my *GENERAL DEFENCES*, before I proceed to answer each particular.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE AUTHOR'S FIRST GENERAL ANSWER,

*Taken from his Title-Page, and word "endeavour'd."*

MEN may be ranked into three forms, of *INTENDERS*, *ENDEAVOURERS*, and *PERFORMERS*.

*INTENDERS* are the first and lowest form; yet so far favoured by some papists, that they maintain, "That a *good* intention, though embracing *ill* means, makes a good action."

PERFORMERS are the third and highest rank ; to which my thoughts dare not aspire, but leave this upper room empty, to be filled by men of better parts and ability.

The middle form consists of ENDEAVOURERS, amongst whom I took my station in the title-page of my book :—

## “THE CHURCH-HISTORY OF BRITAIN,

ENDEAVOURED

BY THOMAS FULLER.”

And as I did not hope that any courteous reader would call me up higher, so I did not fear that any caviller thereat could cast me lower, but that I might still peaceably possess my place of an ENDEAVOURER.

For, what though I fall short of that which I desire, and strive to perform ? I did neither belie myself, nor deceive the reader, who neither was the first, nor shall be the last, of whom it may be truly said, *Magnis excidit ausis* : the fate of many, my betters, who have undertaken to compass high and hard matters.

But it may be objected against me, that, being conscious of my own weakness with the weight of the burden, I should have left the work for some stronger back to bear, and quitted it to those who would not only have endeavoured, but performed, the same.

I answer : First. I did hope, that what was acceptable to God would not be contemptible to good men ; having read, “ If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not,” 2 Cor. viii. 12. Secondly. Seeing this my willingness was attended with a competency of books, records, friends, intelligence, strength, health, and leisure, (be all spoken, not to my praise, but God’s glory,) I did hope something worth the reader’s acceptance might be produced. Lastly. Though failing in what I undertook, I hoped to perform what might be useful and advantageous to abler pens undertaking the same task, and—to use my own (as who should forbid ?) expression—my beams might be scaffolds, my corner-filling-stones for his more beautiful building.

The premises encouraged me to undertake my Church-History ; wherein, if I have not done what the reader expected, let him consider with himself, whether he did not expect what I never promised : who, being unwilling to be cast by the verdict of the ingenuous, for laying my own action too high, have not farced the first page of my book, (like a mountebank’s bill,) pretending no higher but to endeavour.

## CHAPTER V.

## THE SECOND GENERAL ANSWER.

*That many, especially Memory-Mistakes, and Pen-Slips, must be expected in a great Volume.*

It is the advantage of a small book, that the author's eye may in a manner be incumbent at once over it all, from the beginning to the end thereof; a cause why they may be more exactly corrected. A garden hard by one's house is easier weeded and trimmed, than a field lying at some distance. Books which swell to a great volume, cannot be spun with so even a thread, but will run coarser here and there; yea, and have knots in them sometimes, whereof the author is not so sensible as the reader; as the faults in children are not so soon found in them by their own fathers, as by strangers. Thus the poet:—

*Verùm opere in longo fas est obrepere somnum.*

As for memory-mistakes, (which are not the sleeping, but winking, of an author,) they are so far from overthrowing the credit of any book, as a speck, not paring-deep, in the rind of an apple is from proving of the same rotten to the core. Yea, there want not learned writers (whom I need not name) of the opinion, that even the instrumental penmen of the scripture might commit ἀμαρτήματα μνημόνικα; though, open that window to profaneness, and it will be in vain to shut any doors: “Let God be true, and every man a liar.” However, I mention their judgments to this purpose, to show that memory-mistakes have not been counted such heinous matters, but venial in their own nature, as not only finding but deserving pardon.

I confess when such mistakes become common and customary in an author, they mar the credit of his book, and intolerably abuse the reader. Nothing is lighter in itself than a single crumb of sand, yet many of them put together are the heaviest of bodily burdens: “heavier than the sand of the sea,” Job vi. 3. What is slight in itself, if numerous, will become ponderous; but I hope that memory-mistakes and pen-slips in my book will not be found so frequent; and desire the benefit of this plea to be allowed me but four times, in my answer to the Animadvertor: a number low enough, I hope, for the ingenuous reader to grant, though perchance too high for me to request.

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE THIRD GENERAL ANSWER.

*That, in entire Stories of impregnable Truth, it is facile for one to cavil with some Colour at dismembered Passages therein.*

It is an act as easy as unjust, for one to assault a naked sentence, as it stands by itself, disarmed of the assistance of the coherence before and after it. All sentences (except they be entire and independent) have a double strength in them, one inherent, the other relative, and the latter sometimes greater than the former; when what in a sentence is doubtful, is explained; difficult, expounded; defective, supplied; yea, seemingly false, rendered really true by the connexion.

We read in the Life of St. Edward,\* that Harold, cup-bearer to the king, chanced to stumble with the one foot, that he almost kissed the ground; but with the other leg he recovered himself: whereat his father Godwin, earl of Kent, (then dining with the king,) said, "Now one brother doth help another;" to whom the king replied, "And so might my brother have helped me,† if it had so pleased you."

Many times when one sentence in my book hath had a casual slip, the next to it, out of fraternal kindness, would have held it up, (in the apprehension of the reader,) from falling into any great error, had the Animadvertor so pleased; who uncharitably cutteth it off from such support, so that one brother cannot help another; whilst he representeth mangled and maimed passages, to the disadvantage of the sense and writer thereof. Thus one may prove atheism out of scripture itself: "There is no God." But what went before? "The fool hath said in his heart."

I have dealt more fairly in this my Appeal with the Animadvertor; and have not here and there picked out parcels, and cut off shreds where they make most for my advantage; but have presented the whole cloth of his book, (as he will find so, if pleasing to measure it over again,) length and breadth, and list, and fag and all; that so the reader may see of what wool it is made, and [with] what thread it is spun, and thereby be the better enabled to pass his verdict upon it.

\* Cited in CAMDEN'S "Remains," page 241.  
whom Godwin had shamefully murdered.

† Meaning his brother Alfred,

## CHAPTER VII.

## THE FOURTH GENERAL ANSWER.

*That Favour, of course, is indulged to the first (as least perfect) Edition of Books.*

THE first edition of a book, in a difficult subject, hath ever been beheld as less complete; and a liberty of correcting and amending hath been allowed to all authors of this kind.

I will instance in his book,—whose books would I was worthy to bear!—MR. CAMDEN'S "Britannia." His first edition was *a babe* in a little—the second, *a child* in a bigger—octavo; the third, *a youth* in a quarto, but map-less; the last, *a man* in a fair folio: first and last differing more than a galley and galleass, not only in the greatness but perfection,—every newer edition amending the faults of the former.

Next, we will insist in another author above all exception, even the Animadvertor himself, who in his "Epistle to the Reader," before the second and much-altered edition of his "Microcosm," thus expresseth himself, not unhappily either for his own or my purpose:—

"I am not the first of whom it was said, *Secundæ cogitationes sunt meliores*; neither is it a thing rare for children of this nature, to be as often perfected as born. Books have an immortality above their authors. They, when they are full of age and guiltiness, can be retaken into the womb which bred them, and, with a new life, receive a greater portion of youth and glory. Every impression is to them another being; and that always may, and often doth, bring with it a sweeter edition of strength and loveliness. Thus with them age, and each several death, is but an usher to a new birth; each several birth, the mother of a more vigorous perfection."

Had the like liberty of a second edition been allowed me, which the Animadvertor assumed, his pains had been prevented, and most of the faults he hath found in my book (being either detected by myself, or discovered by my friends, communicating the same unto me) had been rectified.

Thus in the Latin tongue the same word *secundus* signifieth both "second" and "successful;" because second undertakings (wherein the failings of the former are observed and amended) generally prove most prosperous.

But it will be objected: "Such second editions with new insertions, additions, and alterations, are no better than pick-pockets to



the reader ; who, having purchased and perused the first edition, is, by this new one, both in his purse and pains equally abused, and his book rendered little better than waste paper."

I answer : First. I am no more obnoxious to this objection than other authors who set forth new editions. Secondly. I hope, my alterations shall not be so many or great as to disguise the second from the first edition. Lastly. I will take order (God willing) for the printing of a piece of paper (less than a leaf) in my second impression, being the index of alteration, so that the owners of the first may, if so pleased, in less than an hour, with their pens, conform their books to the new edition, which, though a little less beautiful to the eye, will be no less beneficial to the users thereof.

Here let me humbly tender to the reader's consideration, that my "Holy War," though (for some design of the stationer) sticking still, in the title-page, at the third edition, (as some unmarried maids will never be more than eighteen,) yet hath it oftener passed the press, as hath my "Holy State," "Meditations," &c. and yet never did I alter line or word in any new impression.

I speak not this by way of attribution to myself, as if my books came forth at first with more perfection than other men's ; but with insinuation to the reader, that it is but equal that I—who have been no common beggar in this kind, yea, never before made use of a second edition—may now have the benefit thereof allowed me, especially in a subject of such length, latitude, difficulty, variety, and multiplicity of matter.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE FIFTH GENERAL ANSWER.

*That it is no Shame for any Man to confess, (when convinced thereof,) and amend, an Error in his Judgment.*

THE knowledge of our Saviour, as God, may be compared to the sun, all-perfect and complete at once without any accession or addition, thereunto ; whilst his knowledge, as man, like the waxing moon, was capable of increase, and was (though not subject to the least error) receptive of clearer information ; and "Jesus increased in wisdom," Luke ii. 28 ; yea, it is expressly said, "Yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered."

Not such the knowledge of the best and wisest man ; which, besides a capability of more instruction, is always attended with an obnoxiousness to many mistakes, seeing "here we know in part,"

1 Cor. xiii. 9 ; and easy it is for any man to come on the blind side of another, as being better versed and skilled in such particular matters.

When, therefore, I find myself convinced in my judgment of an error in my Church-History, by perusing the notes of the Animadvertor, I will fairly and freely confess and amend it.

And I conceive it is no shame at all for a child to write a few lines of Retractation, after so good a father \* hath set him so fair a copy thereof.

In such a case, let not the Animadvertor give me any *blows*, where I conceive that *my own blush* is a sufficient penance for the same ; and let him not immoderately insult on such occasions, seeing my judgment-faults will be found neither in number nor nature such as he hath suggested. Covetous Euclio, in the comedy,† complained that his servant *intromisit sexcentos coquos*, “ had let in six hundred cooks,” when they wanted five hundred ninety-eight of that number, being but two (Anthrax and Congrio) truly told ; and though the Animadvertor frequently complaineth, that I “ run into many errors, run into many errors ;”‡ yet, on examination, many of those errors will prove truths, and such as remain errors will not prove *many*.

Besides, the Animadvertor is concerned to be civil to me in this kind, seeing, in this particular,—

*Veniam pctimus dabimusque vicissim :*

“ A mutual bargain we may make,  
Pardon to give, and pardon take.”

If I were minded to retaliate, and to show that *humanum est errare*, I could instance in many mistakes in the last edition of his “ Geography.” Some of the best birth and brains in our nation, and travellers in foreign parts, as far as India itself, proffered me, on their accord, to detect in several countries unexcusable errors, confuted by their ocular discovery.

I heartily thanked them for that which I refused to accept ; and did return : First. That the book had achieved a general repute, and not undeservedly. Secondly. That it was very useful, and I myself had reaped benefit thereby. Thirdly. That it would seem in me like to revenge in this juncture of time, when the doctor was disadvantaged by some infirmity. Lastly. That others might be detrimented thereby. Yea, if we but look into his “ Short View of the Life and Reign of King Charles,” some faults occur therein,

\* St. Augustine.  
elsewhere.

† *Aulularia* PLAUTI.

‡ Pages 218, 223, and often

which, God willing, I will calmly discover in our Answer to these Animadversions ; not with intent to cloud his credit, but clear my own.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE SIXTH GENERAL ANSWER.

*That prelat Mistakes, in Defiance of all Care, will escape in the best-corrected Book.*

THE most accurate book that ever came forth into light had some mistakes of the press therein. Indeed, I have heard of Robert Stephen, that he offered a great sum of money (equivalent, perchance, to five pounds of our English coin) to such who would discover any *erratum* in his folio Greek Testament, dedicated to king Francis I.

But sure I am, that some of our English Bibles, which may be presumed set forth with the best care, printed at London, have their *erratas*; and, therefore, prelat faults being a catching disease, no wonder if my book, as *well* (or rather, as *ill*) as others, be subject to the same.

Here it will be objected, "That there is a known and sure receipt for the cure of this disease, namely, *the listing* of such faults as have escaped, either in the beginning or end of the book ; that so the reader may, if he please, amend, if otherwise, avoid them. Such an *index erratorum*, or 'catalogue of mistakes,' is, in some sort, a stool of repentance, wherein offenders find their lost innocence ; and such faults, thus confessed, are never charged either on the author's or printer's account."

It is answered, That although such a list of faults generally followeth as the *impedimentum* or "baggage" in the rear of a book, yet seldom or never is it adequate to all the *erratas* which are committed therein.

For, First. All committed are not discovered, neither by the corrector, nor the author himself ; who, perusing his own book, in overlooking the faults therein, *overlooks* them indeed ; and, following the conduct of his own fancy, (wherein he intended all to be right,) readeth the words in his book rather *as they should be*—than *as they are*—printed.

Secondly. All faults which are discovered are not confessed. Such as the printer esteemeth small, he leaveth to be amended by the direction of the sense, and discretion of the reader ; according

to the common speech, that “the reader ought to be better than his book.”

In my book, the index of *erratas* amounts not to above forty; a very small number in proportion of so voluminous a work; which, with credit, might crave the allowance of twice as many more thereunto. The Animadvertor, in these his notes, maketh great advantage of some of these unconfessed faults; and I sometimes plead the mistake of the press for my answer, though seldom, save when some similitude of form in the mistaken letter rendereth it probable for a prelat error.

---

## CHAPTER X.

### THE SEVENTH AND LAST GENERAL ANSWER.

*That an Author, charging his Margin with his Author, is thereby himself discharged.*

HISTORIANS who write of things done at distance, many miles from their dwellings, and more years before their births, must either feign them in their own brains, or fetch them from other credible authors. I say *credible*, such as carry worth and weight with them, substantial persons, subsidy-men (as I may say) in Truth's book; otherwise, for some pamphlets, and all pasquils, I behold them as so many “knights of the post,” even of no reputation.

Now, for the more credit of what is written, and better assurance of the reader, it is very expedient that the author alleged be fully and fairly quoted in the margin, with the tome, book, chapter, leaf, page, and column sometimes, (seldom descending so low as the line,) where the thing quoted is expressed; and, this done, the author is free from fault which citeth it,—though he may be faulty who is cited, if delivering a falsehood.

Indeed, if one become bound as surety for another, he engageth himself to make good the debt in default of the principal. But if he only be bail for his appearance, and accordingly produceth his person in public court, he ought to be discharged without farther trouble.

Semblably, if one not only cites, but commends, the words of an author, then he undertakes for him, adopts his words to be his own, becomes his pledge; and, consequently, is bound to justify and maintain the truth of what he hath quoted. But if he barely allegeth his words, without any closing with them in his judgment, he is only bound for that author's appearance:—understand me, to

justify that such words are exactly extant in manner and form in the place alleged, easy to be found by any who will follow the marginal direction.

This I reserve for my EIGHTH and *last* ANSWER, when taxed by the Animadvertor for such things for which I have presented my author in the margin. In such cases, I conceive, I should be discharged; and if any fees at all be to be paid, I hope the courteous reader, on my request, will remit them, and dismiss me, without more molestation.

---

## CHAPTER XI.

*That many of the Animadvertor's Notes are only additional, not opposite, to what I have written; and that all Things omitted in an History, are not Defects.*

Whoso beholdeth the several places in my book, noted on by the Animadvertor, hath cause, at the first blush, to conclude my Church-History very erroneous and full of faults; out of which, so big a bundle of mistakes have been collected. But, upon serious perusal of these notes, it will appear that a third part of them, at the least, are merely additional, not opposite, to what I have written; so that they render *my* book not for truth the less, but *his* for bulk the greater.

Herein he seemeth like unto those builders who, either wanting materials to erect an entire house, or fearing so frail and feeble a fabric will not stand by itself, run it along the side-walls of another house, whereby they not only save timber, but gain strength to their new edifice.

The Animadvertor had a mind to communicate some new notions he had to the world, but he found them not many and weighty enough to fill a just book for sale; whereupon, he resolves to range his notions against my Church-History, that so, partly carping thereat, and partly adding thereto, he might, betwixt both, make up a book competent for sale.

Hence it is that, sometimes not liking my language, (as not proper and expressive enough,) he substituted his own, with little or no variation of matter; and sometimes adds new passages: some whereof I could formerly have inserted, but because I perceived my book (as the reader is sensible by the price thereof) grown already to too great a volume.

When additional notes frequently occur, I conceive myself not obliged in the least degree to return an answer thereunto, as being

rather besides than against what I have written. However, if I have left out any thing, it would have been suspected I had omitted that which most had made against me; to prevent which jealousy, such additional notes are also here *verbatim* represented.

To such as object, that the Animadvertor's additions are supplementary of the defects in my Church-History, I answer, that a defect properly is *absentia debiti adesse*, "the absence of what ought to be there;" so that a thing is maimed or lame without it.

But additions to an history are reducible to these two heads, namely, either 1. Such as they *must* without imperfection be added: 2. Such as they *may* without impertinency be added.

Few, if any, of the former, some of the latter, kind are found in the Animadvertor's additory notes. And let me tell him, that if he writes books against all who have written books, and [who] have not written all which may be said of their subject, he may even write against all who have ever written books; and then he will have work enough.

Let us go no farther than to his own "Geography;" being sure he is too judicious to be so conceited of his own pains, as to think he hath inserted all that may be said of so large a subject.

The story is well known of Æsop's master, who, buying two servants together in the market-place, demanded of one of them, what he could do. He answered, that he would do all things, do all things! Then the other, (Æsop himself,) being asked what he could do, answered, he could do nothing. His master seeming angry to keep so unprofitable a servant, "How can I," returned Æsop, "do any thing, when my fellow-servant will do all, and leave me nothing to do?" \*

If Dr. Heylin hath done *all things* in his "Geography," he hath given a writ of ease for ever to posterity, who may despair to merit more of that matter. All who hereafter shall write a new book of Geography, must also find out a new world with Columbus, as anticipated by the doctor, having formerly completed all on that subject.

I presume not to say, that I have in my Church-History done *all things*; having written many and most material passages, leaving the rest to others. But this I say, that all things left out in a history are not wanting; neither are all things wanting, defects, if not essential thereunto. As for some of the Animadvertor's added notes, they are no more needful or useful than a sixth finger to a man's hand, as (God willing) in due time shall appear.

\* In *Vitâ Æsopi*.

## CHAPTER XII.

*That the Author designed unto himself no Party-pleasing in writing his Church-History.*

PARTIALITY is constantly charged on me by the Animadvertor, and once, with a witness, as followeth:—

“ We see by this, as by like passages, which way our author’s bowl is *biased*; how constantly he declares himself in favour of those who have either separated from the church, or appeared against it.”—HEYLIN’S *Examen*, part i. page 257.

I return, (to prosecute his metaphor,) that I have used as upright bowls as ever any that enter the alley of History, since our civil dissensions.

I do freely declare myself, that I, in writing my book, am for the church of England, as it stood established by law; the Creed being the contracted Articles, and the Thirty-nine Articles the expanded Creed of her doctrine, as the Canons of her discipline. And still I prize her favour highest, though for the present it be least worth,—as little able to protect, and less to prefer, any that are faithful to her interest.

As for pleasing of parties, I never designed or endeavoured it. There were a kind of philosophers called *Electici*, which were of none, yet of all, sects; and who would not engage, in gross, in the opinions of any philosophers, but did pick and choose, here and there, what they found consonant to truth, either amongst the Stoics, Peripatetics, Academics, or (misinterpreted) Epicures, receiving that, and rejecting the rest. Such my project, to commend in all parties what I find praiseworthy, and condemn the rest; on which account, some flee, some frown, none smile upon me.

First. For the Papists, though I malice not their persons, and have a pity (as God, I hope, hath a mercy) for many amongst them; yet I do, as occasion is offered, dislike their errors, whereby I have incurred and (according to their principles) deserved their displeasure.

The old Nonconformists—being the same with the modern Presbyterians, but depressed and under, as the modern Presbyterians are the old Nonconformists, but vertical and in authority—do (though the Animadvertor twitteth me constantly to advocate for them) take great and general exception at me; and it is not long since, in a meeting of the most eminent amongst them, I was told that I put too much gall into my ink against them.

The Independent, being the Benjamin of parties, (and his mess I assure you is none of the least, Gen. xliii. 44,) taxeth me for too



much fieriness, as the Animadvertor (in his expression lately cited) chargeth me for too much favour unto them.

Thomas lord Coventry, when coming from the chancery to sit down at dinner, was wont to say, "Surely, to-day I have dealt equally, for I have displeased both sides." I hope that I have his *happiness*, (for I am sure I have his *unhappiness*,) that, having disoblged all parties, I have written the very truth. Thus I can only privately comfort myself in my own innocence, and hope that, when my head is laid low, what seems too sweet, too bitter, too salt, too fresh to the present divided age, will be adjudged well-tasted and seasoned to the palate of impartial posterity.

---

### CHAPTER XIII.

*What Good the Animadvertor might, but would not, do ; and what Good, by God's Goodness, he herein hath done unto the Author.*

WHEN the Animadvertor had perused my book, marking some (but making more) faults therein, it was in his power to have done me a pleasure, the greatest he could give, or I receive ; namely, not to paradigmize me ; but, by letter in an amicable way, to impart my mistakes unto me, that I might amend them in my next edition. Say not, "He owed me no such thing ;" who would have beheld it not as a debt paid unto, but alms bestowed upon, me.

I was not wholly without hope hereof, having found such favour from some worthy friends. Had the Animadvertor done the like, how had he obliged me ! As the Society of Peter-house do preserve the pictures of their benefactors in their parlour, so would I have erected unto him a monument of gratitude in my heart, beside my public acknowledgment of the courtesy.

But it seems he intended not my information, but defamation. However, he hath done to me a great good turn, for which (because not intended) I will thank God, namely, he by his causeless carping hath allayed in me the delight in writing of Histories ; seeing nothing can be so unpartially and inoffensively written, but some will carp thereat.

Mothers, minding to wean their children, use to put soot, worm-wood, or mustard on the nipples of their breasts. God foresaw I might suck to a surfeit in writing Histories, which hath been a thief in the lamp of my life, wasting much oil thereof. My head and hand had robbed my heart in such delightful studies. Wherefore, he raised the bitter pen of the Animadvertor to wean me from such digressions from my vocation.

I now experimentally find the truth of Solomon's words : " Of making many books there is no end," Eccles. xii. 12. Not, but that all perfect books (I mean perfect in sheets, otherwise none save scripture perfect) have *finis* in the close thereof ; or that any author is so irrational, but he propounds an end to himself before he begins it ; but that in " making of many books there is no end ; " that is, the writers of them seldom or never do attain that end which they propound to themselves, especially if squinting at sinister ends ; as who is not flesh and blood ? Such as project wealth to themselves are commonly, by unwise managing, or casual miscarriage, impaired thereby in their estates. Others who designed to themselves (with the builders of Babel) to get them a name, commonly meet with shame and disgrace. Or else, when their books are ended, yet they are not ended ; because, though never so cautiously written, some antagonists will take up the bucklers against them, so that they must begin again after they have ended, (or sink in their credits,) to write in their own vindication : which is my case, enough to take off my edge, formerly too keen, in making multiplicity of books.

I confess, I have yet one History ready for the press, which I hope will be for God's glory and honour of our nation. This new-built ship is now on the stocks, ready to be launched ; and being a vessel of " great burden," God send me some good adventurers to bear part of the expense. This done, I will never meddle more with making any books of this nature. It is a provident way, before writing leave us, to leave off writing ; and the rather, because scribbling is the frequentative thereof.

If, therefore, my petitioning and optative AMEN shall meet with God's commissioning and imperative AMEN, I will hereafter totally attend the concernments of my calling, and what directly and immediately shall tend to the advance of devotion in myself and in others, as preparatory to my dissolution out of this state of mortality.

---

## CHAPTER XIV.

*That the Author is unjustly charged by the Animadvertor for being agreeable to the Times ; and how far forth such Agreeableness is consistent with Christian Prudence.*

THE Animadvertor is pleased to charge me to be a great temporizer, and agreeable to the times.\* In order to my defence herein, let me premise this distinction :—That there is a sinful and sinless agreeableness with the times, be they never so bad.

\* Page 265, towards the bottom thereof.

It is a *sinful agreeableness*, when people, for their private profit or safety, or both, are resolved in belief and life, faith and fact, doctrine and manners, to be the same with the times;—how contrary soever they be unto the will and word of God. Be it Bible, or Talmud, or Alcoran, or Mass-book, or Common-prayer book, or Directory; any, many, all, or no manner of God's public service;—to them, all is alike, and equally embraced.

But there is also a *sinless*, yea, lawful and necessary, *agreeableness to the times*; insomuch that no meaner Father than St. Ambrose, or worse critic than Erasmus, read the text Romans xii. 11, *Δεσύοντες τῷ καιρῷ*, "Serving the time." A reading countenanced by the context: "Rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation, continuing in prayer;" all being directions of our demeanour in dangerous times. And even those who dislike the reading as false, defend the doctrine as true; that though we must not be slaves and vassals, we may be servants to the times, so far forth as not to disserve God thereby.

This sinless and lawful agreeableness with the times is partly passive, partly active.

1. *Passive* chiefly consisteth in bearing and forbearing.

BEARING, in paying all pecuniary burdens imposed; it being but equal (in my opinion) there to return tribute where we receive protection. I doubt not but in this point even the Animadvertor himself is agreeable to the times, going along with the rest of his neighbours in their paying of all public taxes.

FORBEARING expresseth itself, First, in silence. The Spanish proverb, true at all—is necessary in dangerous—times: "Where the mouth is shut, no fly doth enter." Yea, the Spirit of God giveth his servants this counsel: "Therefore the prudent shall keep silence in that time, for it is an evil time," Amos v. 13. Thus, holding of one's peace, that is, using no provoking language against the present power, procureth holding of one's peace, that is, retaining and possessing of one's safety and quiet.

Secondly. Forbearing consisteth in refraining (though not without secret sorrow) from some laudable act which he heartily desireth, but dares not do, as visibly destructive to his person and estate, being prohibited by the predominant powers. In such a case a man may—to use the apostle's phrase, *διὰ τὴν ἐνεσῶσαν ἀνάγκην*, "for the present necessity," 1 Cor. vii. 26—omit many things pleasing to, but not commanded by, that God who preferreth mercy before sacrifice.

For instance: If any earthly prince or power should enjoin a Christian (as Darius did Daniel) not to pray to God "for the space of thirty days together," Dan. vi. 7; his command is not to be

obeyed, as contrary to God's positive precept : "Pray continually," 1 Thess. v. 17. But if he should only enjoin him to forbear such a form of prayer, allowing him liberty to use any other ; I conceive that such an omission lawful, dictated unto him by the principles of prudence, for his self-preservation.

2. The *active* part of lawful agreeableness with the times, is in doing what they enjoin, as being indifferent ; and sometimes so good, that our own conscience doth or should enjoin the same. In such a case, where there is a concurrence of both together, it is neither dishonesty nor indiscretion for one in himself to conceal his own inclinations, and publicly to put his actions (as fasting, thanksgiving, preaching, &c.) on the account of conformity to the times ; it being (as flattery to court, so no less) folly to condemn and reject the favour of the times, when it may be had without the least violation, yea, possibly, with an improvement, of our own conscience.

I have endeavoured to steer my carriage by the compass aforesaid ; and my main motive thereunto was, that I might enjoy the benefit of my ministry, the bare using whereof is the greatest advancement I am capable of in this life. I know, all stars are not of the same bigness and brightness : some shine, some only twinkle ; and allowing myself of the latter size and sort, I would not willingly put out my own (though dim) light in total darkness, nor would bury my half-talent, hoping by putting it forth to gain another half-talent thereby, to the glory of God, and the good of others.

But it will be objected against me, that it is suspicious (at the least) that I have bribed the times with some base compliance with them, because they have reflected so favourably upon me. Otherwise, how cometh it to pass, that my fleece, like Gideon's, is dry, when the rest of my brethren of the same party are wet with their own tears ? I being permitted preaching, and peaceable enjoying of a parsonage.

I answer, First, I impute this peaceableness I enjoy to God's undeserved goodness on my unworthiness. "He hath not dealt thus with all my brethren," above me in all respects. God maketh people sometimes, *potius reperire quàm invenire gratiam*, "to find the favours they sought not for." If I am one of them whom God hath made "to be pitied of those who carried me away captive," Psalm cvi. 46, I hope, I shall be thankful unto him ; and others, I hope, will not be envious at me for so great a mercy.

Next to the fountain of God's goodness, I ascribe my liberty of preaching to the favour of some great friends God hath raised up for me. It was not a childish answer, though the answer of a child to his father, taxing him for being proud of his new coat, "I am glad," said he, "but not proud of it." Give me leave to be glad,

and joyful in myself, for my good friends ; and to desire, and endeavour their continuance and increase. “ A friend in the court ” hath always been accounted “ as good as a penny in the council, as a pound in the purse.” Nor will any rational man condemn me for making my addresses to and improvement of them, seeing the Animadvertor himself (as I am informed) hath his friend in the council ; and it is not long since he had occasion to make use of his favour.

I must not forget “ the Articles of Exeter,” whereof I had the benefit, living and waiting there on the king’s daughter at the rendition thereof: Articles, which, both as penned and performed, were the best in England ;—thanks to their wisdom who so warily made, and honesty, who so well observed them ! Nor was it (though last-named) least causal of my quiet, that (happy criticism to myself as I may call it !) I never was formally sequestered, but went, before driven away, from my living ; which took off the edge of the Ordinance against me, that the weight thereof fell but slantingly upon me. Thus when God will fasten a favour on any person, (though never so unworthy,) he ordereth the concurrences of all things contributive thereunto.

All I will add is this,—that hitherto (and I hope, who hath [kept] will keep me, I speak it in the presence of God) I have not, by my pen or practice to my knowledge, done any thing unworthily to the betraying of the interest of the church of England ; and if it can be proved, let my mother-church not only “ spit in my face,” (the expression, it seems, of parents amongst the Jews, when they were offended with their children for some misdemeanour, Num. xii. 14,) but also “ spew me out of her mouth.” Some will say, “ Such a vaunt savoureth of a pharisaical pride.” I utterly deny it. For even the publican, after he came from his confession he had made in the temple, “ God be merciful to me a sinner,” Luke xviii. 13, had he met one in the outward court, accusing and taxing him with such particular sins whereof he was guiltless, would no doubt have replied in his own just defence. And seeing I am on my purgation, in what the Schools term *justitia causæ*, (though not *personæ*,) I cannot say less (as I will no more) in my justification.

Thus have I represented the reader with the true complexion of my cause ; and though I have not painted the face thereof with false colours, I hope I have washed from it the foul aspersion of temporizing or sinful agreeableness with the times, which the Animadvertor causelessly casts upon it.

So much for my outward carriage in reference to the times : meantime what the thoughts of my heart have been thereof, I am

not bound to make a discovery, to my own danger. Sure I am, such who are "peaceable and faithful in Israel," 2 Sam. xx. 19, may nevertheless be "mourners in Zion," Isaiah lxi. 3, and grieve at what they cannot mend, but must endure. This also I know, that that spoke in the wheel which creaketh most doth not bear the greatest burden in the cart. The greatest complainers are not always the greatest sufferers; whilst as much, yea, more, sincere sorrow may be managed in secret silence, than with querulous and clamorous obstreperousness; and such, who will neither print nor preach satires on the times, may make elegies on them in their own souls.

---

DR. HEYLIN'S TITLE-PAGE.

---

*EXAMEN HISTORICUM:*

OR

A DISCOVERY AND EXAMINATION

OF THE

MISTAKES, FALSITIES, AND DEFECTS IN SOME  
MODERN HISTORY.

PART I.

CONTAINING

NECESSARY ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

THE CHURCH-HISTORY OF BRITAIN,

AND

THE HISTORY OF CAMBRIDGE,

PUBLISHED

BY THOMAS FULLER:

FOR VINDICATION OF THE TRUTH, THE CHURCH, AND THE INJURED  
CLERGY.

*Non possumus aliquid adversus veritatem: sed pro veritate.*—2 Cor. xiii. 8.

*Et veritas quidem obvia est, sed requiruntibus.*—MINUTIUS FELIX in Octavio.

FULLER.—THE challenge is no part of the combat; nor the mountebank's bill, of the cure. It is answer enough to a title-page, to return, "It is but a title-page." Whereas the doctor intituleth his notes on my book "Animadversions," know, *animadvertere* in Latin signifieth, "to mark and observe;" but rather by the way of *reproof* than *approbation*. And, in a secondary sense, it importeth "to correct, chastise, and severely to punish" a (reputed) malefactor; as the doctor, in a judicatory of his own erecting, (without any commission for the same,) hath herein passed many most heavy censures on me, before he heard what I could say in my own just defence.

Whereas the Animadvertor proceedeth as followeth:—

## ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

THE CHURCH-HISTORY OF BRITAIN,

AND

THE HISTORY OF CAMBRIDGE,

PUBLISHED

BY THOMAS FULLER:

FOR VINDICATION OF THE TRUTH, THE CHURCH, AND THE INJURED CLERGY.

He hath done me more right than he was aware of, or was willing to do; for those indeed were the three principal motives of my weak endeavours in my Church-History. However, because he intended those words to relate not to my History, but his own Animadversions thereon, let the reader judge to which of our two works they bear the best and most proper reference.

The words of St. Paul, *Non possumus aliquid adversus veritatem, sed pro veritate*, "We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth," 2 Cor. xiii. 8, well fitted the mouth of the apostle, divinely inspired in his writings only to be a champion for the truth. In one sense I allow them also applicable to the Animadvertor, according to the received rule, *Illud possumus, quod jure possumus*, "We can do that which we can lawfully do." But otherwise, I humbly conceive that St. Paul could not, and the Animadvertor should not, do any thing against the truth.

All that I will add is this,—that although the doctor be pleased to call his notes "Necessary Animadversions," (who can blame the loving father for giving his own dear babe a good name?) yet, upon



serious examination, it will appear that some of these Animadversions ought to have been omitted, for the promoting of piety; and many of them might have been omitted, without any prejudice to the truth: as in due time and place, God willing, shall be observed.

DR. HEYLIN.—“A GENERAL PREFACE TO THE WHOLE.”—It is affirmed of history by the famous orator, that it is *testis temporum*, “the witness and record of time,” by which the actions of it are transmitted from one age to another. And therefore it concerns all those who apply themselves to the writing of Histories to take special care, that all things be laid down exactly, faithfully, and without deviation from the truth in the least particular. For if the witnesses be suborned, the record falsified, or the evidence wrested, neither posterity can judge rightly of the actions of this present time, nor this time give a certain judgment of the ages past.

FULLER.—Although Mr. Sanderson is equally concerned with myself in this General Preface, yet, because I am beheld as the principal malefactor, I have here presented it entire. I look on it thus far as but the flourish or illumining of a text and initial letter, signifying nothing in itself; and therefore let him proceed to something more material.

DR. HEYLIN.—It is therefore a good direction which Josephus the historian gives us, and which he followed as it seems in his “Jewish Antiquities,” not only to be careful that the style be pleasing, but that the whole work be framed by the level and line of truth. *Nam qui Historiam et rerum propter antiquitatem obscurarum expositionem, &c.* “They,” saith he, “who make profession to write Histories, and to recite such things as are obscured by antiquity, ought not only studiously to conform their style, but also to beautify the same with ornaments of eloquence, to the intent the reader may converse in their writings with the more delectation. But, above all things, they must have an especial care *so exactly to set down the truth*, that they who know not how those things came to pass may be the more duly and fitly informed.”—*Antiquit. lib. xiv. cap. 1.*

FULLER.—I acknowledge that this is the character of a complete historian, to which all in their writings ought to aspire with their best endeavours; though I believe none ever attained to the height thereof.

But first I would fain know, (seeing these are “necessary Animadversions,”) what need there was of that long Latin line, (staved off at last with an *et cetera*,) seeing Josephus did write in Greek. And if the doctor would have presented us with the original, it should have been in Greek; if but with a translation, it might only have been in English.

I behold Josephus as a worthy historian, whose memory I deservedly honour; yet herein he might say with the poet, *Monitis sum minor ipse meis*, "He in his practice fell far short of his precepts;" witness his inserting of this false passage, opposite to the very letter of the Old Testament, speaking of Jehoiakim king of Judah:—

<p>"And he did what was evil in the sight of the Lord, according to all that his father had done." 2 Kings xxiv. 9.</p>	<p>‘Ο δὲ φύσει χρηστὸς ὢν καὶ δίκαιος.          "This man being merciful and just by his nature," &amp;c. JOSEPHUS, <i>Antiq. Jud.</i> lib. xvi. cap. 9.</p>
---	--

But because it is not my work to accuse Josephus, (whom I cannot praise and prize enough,) but to defend myself against the Animadvertor, let us proceed.

DR. HEYLIN.—There is another rule which he bound himself to, that is to say, "Neither to omit any thing through ignorance, nor to bury any thing in forgetfulness." And all these cautions, well observed, make a perfect History.

FULLER.—Here is the Elixir indeed of historical perfection. Let a glorified saint write such an history of the church-triumphant, that so there may be a just proportion betwixt the author and his subject, both being perfect.

I have met with this distich made by reverend Bernard Gilpin,\* upon such sectaries as require exactness in our church of England:

*Optant ut careat maculis Ecclesia cunctis ;  
 Præsens vita negat, vita futura dabit.*

Thus Englished by bishop Carleton:—

"Men wish our church no blemish had at all;  
 It cannot be so here, in heaven it shall."

This is true both of our church and all church-histories; whereof none without faults, and they the best which have the fewest.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, on the contrary, there are some who do spend themselves on the style and dress, as if their business rather were to delight the ear than inform the judgment: others, so biassed by self-ends and private interest, that they seem rather advocates to plead for some growing party, than true reporters of affairs as they be before them. Some, who, endeavouring to be copious, clap all together in a huddle which is offered to them, without relation to the ornaments and attire of language; and others, with like carelessness as unto themselves, but greater inconvenience as unto the reader, examine not the truth and certainty of what they write, so they write somewhat which they think may inform the reader. Betwixt these, truth

\* In his "Life," page 103.

is oftentimes irrecoverably lost, the reader led aside from the ways of verity into the crooked lanes of error; and many times conducted to such dangerous precipices as may prove destructive to himself, and of ill consequence to all those which are guided by him. The errors of the understanding, in matters which may possibly be reduced to practice, are far more mischievous than those which do consist in the niceties of speculation, and advance no farther; which moved the orator, not only to honour History with the attribute of *testis temporum*, but to style it also by the name of *magistra vitæ*.

FULLER.—I remember when the reverend Vice-Master of Trinity College in Cambridge was told that one of the scholars had abused him in an oration. “Did he,” said he, “name me? Did he name Thomas Harrison?” And when it was returned that he named him not; “Then,” said he, “I do not believe that he meant me.” Although it is very suspicious that I am the mark aimed at in this discourse; yet being not conscious of such faults to myself, and because I am not named by him, I will not understand myself intended, till he toucheth me with more personal particularities.

DR. HEYLIN.—These things, considered as they ought, have made me wonder many times at the unadvisedness of some late writers in this kind, whose Histories are composed with so much partiality on the one side, and so much inadvertency on the other, that they stand more in need of a commentator to expound the truth, and lay it clear and open to the view of the reader, than either the dark words of Aristotle, or any other obscure piece of the ancient writers. I speak of Histories here, not Libels: Of which last sort, I reckon Weldon's pamphlet, called “The Court of King James;” and Wilson's most infamous Pasquil of the reign of that King; in which it is not easy to judge, whether the matter be more false, or the style more reproachful in all parts thereof. Certain I am we may affirm of them as Cremutius Cordus doth of the “Epistles of Antonius,” and the “Orations of Brutus:” *Falsa quidem in Augustum probra, sed multâ cum acerbitate habent*; that is to say, that “they contained not only false and disgraceful passages against the honour of Augustus, but were appareled also in the habit of scurrilous language.”—TACITUS *Annal.* lib. iv. With such as these I shall not meddle at the present, leaving their crimes unto the punishment not of an *Index*—but an *Ignis—expurgatorius*, as most proper for them.

FULLER.—I am not concerned at all in this paragraph; only let me add this in the honour of the deceased Robert earl of Warwick, who told me at Beddington, that when Wilson's book in manuscript was brought unto him, he expunged out of it more than an hundred offensive passages. “My lord,” said I, “you have done well; and you had done better, if you had put out one hundred more.”

DR. HEYLIN.—But as for those whom either the want of true intelligence, or inadvertency in not weighing seriously what they were to do, or the too much indulgence to their own affections, have made more capable of being bettered by correction, I have thought it more agreeable to the rules of justice to rectify their mistakes, and reform their errors, than absolutely to condemn and decry their writings.

FULLER.—Reforming of errors is a specious and glorious design, especially when proportionable means are used in order thereunto. But of late the word “ reformation ” is grown so threadbare, it hath no nap left it, thereunder to cover foul acts to attain a fair end. I much suspect the Animadvertor will prove such a deforming-reformer, as our age hath produced too many of them.

DR. HEYLIN.—At this time I have two before me, whom I conceive to stand in need of such observations, by which the truth may be preserved, and the clear face of things presented to the reader’s eye ; the one of them an author of ecclesiastical, the other of some civil, Histories.

FULLER.—I commend the valour of the Animadvertor, to combat with two at once ; odds, on which Hercules himself durst not adventure. I also am to deal with two, the Animadvertor and Dr. Cosins, but not as a challenger, but in the notion of a poor defendant ; and if one be assaulted by two hundred, he may and must guard himself against them as well as he can.

DR. HEYLIN.—In both I find the truth much injured, and in one the church. The errors of the one tend not to the subversion of any public interest ; but, being errors, may misguide the reader in the way of his knowledge and discourse ; and therefore I have rectified him with some “ Advertisements,” (not taking notice of such passages as have been made the subject of some “ Observations ” from another hand,) that so he may be read with the greatest profit.

FULLER.—This is meant of Mr. Sanderson. I am not so devilishly-minded as to desire all men might be equally faulty with myself, that so, being involved with others in a joint-guiltiness of the same degree, I might on that account pretend to a mock innocence. If Mr. Sanderson’s pen be less peccant than mine, I congratulate his condition, and provide to answer to my own charge, which followeth.

DR. HEYLIN.—The other (besides errors of this kind too many) hath intermingled his discourse with some positions of a dangerous nature ; which, being reduced into practice, as they easily may, not only overthrow the whole power of the church, as it stands constituted and established by the laws of the land, but lay a probable foundation for the like disturbances in the civil state.

FULLER.—*Si satis sit accusasse, quis innocens?* saith Tertullian. To this double indictment I plead “not guilty,” and put myself on the trial of God and good men, requesting the reader’s patience till the proofs on both sides be produced.

DR. HEYLIN.—And therefore I have fitted him with some “Animadversions” in the way of an Antidote, that so he may be read, if possible, without any danger.

FULLER.—Common custom hath overswayed the word “Antidote” to signify a defensative against, or expulsive of, poison. However, the bare notation of the word advanceth no further than to import “something *given against* ;” in which sense none of our nation hath been so free of his Antidotes as the Animadvertor ; having given them against Mr. Calvin, archbishop Williams, archbishop Usher, Dr. Hackwell, Dr. Prideaux, Dr. Bernard, Mr. Lestrange, Mr. Sanderson, and my unworthy self ;—no shame to follow in the rear after such a van and main-battle.

Sure I am, his pretended Antidote on my book hath more of poison than cordial therein, envenoming many plain and true passages, sound and solid sentences, with his false glosses, forced inferences, and pestilent applications.

DR. HEYLIN.—I know well how invidious a task I have undertaken, and that it will be charged upon me, at the first apprehensions of it, that I have rather chosen to find fault with the writings of others, than to write any things of this kind, which may be subject to the like partialities and mistakings. *Carpere vel noli nostra, vel ede tua*, might come in seasonably here, if I had not somewhat to allege for my justification. But when the reasons which induced me to the first adventure (mentioned in the Introduction following) be seriously considered, as they ought to be, I hope I shall be capable of excuse at the least, if not of pardon.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor hath here raised up, I assure you, a strong spirit against himself ; and whether the spells, here used by him, be able to conjure it down again, others must decide it ; mean time, fight Animadvertor, fight objection of his own making, seeing I have neither skill nor will to interpose to part them.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, for my venturing on the other, I shall say nothing more at the present, but that, as well my love to truth, as to do right unto the author, (whom I would willingly look on as a man well-principled, and of no ill affections to church or state,) hath invited me to it.

FULLER.—Here my credit is more deeply wounded by the glance of a bullet, than if it were directly shot against me. For

whereas he saith, that he "would willingly look on" Mr. Sander-son "as a man well-principled, and of no ill affections to church or state," he concludes me, by plain intimation, disaffected to both. But I hope that those who are clear-sighted look on me under a better notion.

DR. HEYLIN.—Truth is the mistress which I serve.

FULLER.—"Rough though I am, I have a mistress too," and her the self-same with the Animadvertor's. Be it referred to her, to judge betwixt us, which of us hath [done,] doth, or shall do her the better service; and let him be received, the other rejected.

DR. HEYLIN.—And I presume that none will be offended with me because I tell them of their errors in a modest way, and bear witness for them to that truth of which they do profess themselves such especial lovers. In that great disputation betwixt the esquires of the body of king Darius, whether the king, wine, women, or the truth, were of greatest power, the whole assembly cried out in behalf of truth, *Magna est veritas, et prævalet*; that is to say, "Great is truth, and mighty above all things."—Esdras iv. 41.

FULLER.—I acknowledge this a canonical truth, though written in the Apocrypha. It will soon be seen, who will shout most at the triumphs of truth, I or the Animadvertor, cor-rival with me to the same mistress.

DR. HEYLIN.—So that, in standing for the truth, without consideration unto "the recompence of reward," I hope, though I meet some adversaries, I shall find more friends.

FULLER.—Here he soareth so high a flight I cannot follow him; yea, I suspect, that in reaching so high a note he hath strained (if not broken) his voice. What, no reflection on a reward? He might have had an intuition at it, as the encouragement, though not the cause, of his pains; he might look at, in, through, and beyond the reward, without the least mixture of any mercenariness. Sure I am, that one of as much meekness, as some are of moroseness, even upright Moses himself, in his service of the essential and increated truth, (of higher consequence than the historical truth controverted betwixt us,) had notwithstanding "a respect to the recompence of reward," Heb. xi. 26.

DR. HEYLIN.—If not, (for I am at a reasonable pass for that,) it shall be no small comfort to me, that the weak candle of my studies hath given light to others, whereby they may discern some historical truths even in the darkest mists of error, which either partiality or incogitancy hath cast before the eyes of unwary readers.

FULLER.—The reader in due time will judge, whether his candle hath by the *light* thereof discovered more truths, or by the *smoke* thereof darkened more, or given more just offence by the unsavoury *snuff* thereof.

DR. HEYLIN.—Which said, I shall now add no more, but that, having two patients under cure of different tempers, it is not to be thought that I should administer unto both the same kind of physic; an ordinary purge being sufficient for the one, whereas the foul body of the other doth require a fluxing; as some wounds may be healed with balm, when others, more corrupt and putrified, do exact a lancing.

FULLER.—Which said, I shall now add no more, but that, having two adversaries, Dr. Heylin and Dr. Cosins to encounter, it is not to be thought that I should proceed against both alike; Dr. Cosins hath merited much of the Protestant cause in France, and thereby commands my pen to pay the homage of due reverence to the crown of his old age, especially “when found in the way of truth.” But I am not under any such obligation of particular respect to Dr. Heylin on the same account.

I could wish he had used a more cleanly metaphor, and forborne the phrase of “fluxing.” Such a cure appears not in Hippocrates, as being a modern remedy for a modern malady. However, would I were but half so holy as he was of whom it was said, “An evil disease, say they,” (and they did but say it,) “cleaveth fast unto him,” Psalm xli. 8.

I will use no harsher metaphor in relation of my answers to my two antagonists than only, That men may meddle with a mallow with naked hands, but need to put on their hedging-gloves when to deal with a thorn or nettle.

Only here I shall presume to request the reader to take especial notice of those remarkable words of the Animadvertor: “Tell them of their errors in a modest way;” and keep them against a rainy day; I mean, such a seasonable time as we may make use thereof.

DR. HEYLIN.—But so it happeneth many times, that some men are more impatient of the cure, than sensible of their diseases; and that, instead of giving thanks to the physician, for the great pains he took about them, they pay him with nothing but displeasures. Which being the worst that can befall me, I am armed against it.

FULLER.—But so it happeneth many times, that, as in this case, there may be *plus periculi a medico quàm a morbo*, “More danger of the physician than of the disease.” A good belief and conceit of the physician is more than half a cure; and I confess I have none of the Animadvertor; whom I behold but as an adventur-



ous empiric, having seen and marked his practice on other patients, rather disgracing their persons than amending their errors. Give me a physician *of my own election*, not *of his intrusion*; especially when he usually wrappeth up his best receipts in poisoned papers.

DR. HEYLIN.—If by the hazard of my peace I shall procure this benefit to the present and succeeding times,—that men may prove more careful of what they write, and not obtrude upon the reader (either through ignorance, inadvertency, or somewhat worse) such and so many falsities, mistakes, and errors, as have been lately put upon him in some modern histories,—it is that I aimed at; and, having gained that point, I have gained my purpose.

FULLER.—But what if, on the contrary, (which is more probable,) it cometh to pass, that some, having commendable inclinations and proportionable qualifications to write Histories, perceiving their books, *Damnatos antequàm natos*, “banned before born,” by the prejudice which this Animadvertor bears their parents; who is ready, as soon as their books shall peep out of the press, to assault them with causeless cavils:—What, I say, if such persons, on the tender resentment of the premises, shall quit all their intentions to write? The Animadvertor can little comfort himself, and others will less commend him, for this his over-activity, so destructive to the public good. But there are some, who, when they can no longer bewitch with their beauty, endeavour to do it with their malice, thereby to render themselves in any sort considerable; to be feared, when they are no more loved. All I will add is this: He who, already having one of his feet in the grave, will spurn his brother with the other, will find few to pity him, if falling all along for his pains.

DR. HEYLIN.—*Non partis studiis agimur, sed sumpsimus arma  
Consiliis inimica tuis, Ignavia fallax.*

PETER HEYLIN.

FULLER.—This distich, whereof the Animadvertor (by the immediate subscription of his name thereunto) may to some seem the author, is frequently cited by Mr. Selden, and may thus be Englished:—

“We serve no sides, nor parties seek to please,  
But do defy sloth and deceiving ease.”

However, I humbly conceive that, what faults soever I am guilty of, the sin of sloth cannot justly, especially in my Church-History, be laid to my charge.

1. All passages of church-concernment from the reign of Henry III. until king Henry VI. I got exactly written and attested out of the Records in the Tower.

2. The most material transactions in all convocations since the Reformation till the time of queen Elizabeth, (save that sometimes the Journals be very defective, which was no fault of mine,) I transcribed out of the Registers of Canterbury.

3. I have by much labour procured many letters and other rarities, which formerly never did see the light, out of the library of Sir Thomas Cotton and others.

4. The learned Mr. Selden (on his own desire) honoured my first four Centuries with reading, and returned them unto me some weeks after, without any considerable alterations.

5. The best antiquaries of England (amongst whom the archbishop of Armagh, it being not then my happiness to be known to the learned and religious Sir R. Twisden,) I consulted with. These now I forbear to name, lest I remove and derive the Animadvertor's anger on them from myself, who am (though not the most able) the best-prepared to endure his displeasure.

Give me leave to add, that a greater volume of general Church-History might be made with less time, pains, and cost; for in the making thereof, I had straw provided me to burn my brick; I mean, could find what I needed, in printed books. Whereas in this British Church-History, I must (as well as I could) provide my own straw; and my pains have been scattered all over the land, by riding, writing, going, sending, chiding, begging, praying, and sometimes paying too, to procure manuscript materials.

These particulars seriously considered, I hope it will appear, that the Animadvertor unjustly chargeth sloth on my account, and tyrannically crieth out with Pharaoh, "Ye are idle, idle are you," Exodus v. 17. Yea, I hope, I may alter the property of the Animadvertor's distich, and turn his sword into my shield after this manner:—

*Non partis studiis agimur, sed sumpsimus arma  
Consiliis peramica tuis, Industria doctrix.*

THOMAS FULLER.

---

## A N A N S W E R

TO

DR. HEYLIN'S NECESSARY INTRODUCTION, &c.

1. DR. HEYLIN.—Intending some short Animadversions on the "Church-History of Britain," for vindication of the truth, the church, and the injured clergy, I have thought good to prepare the way unto

them by a plain but necessary "Introduction," touching the quality and nature of the book which I have in hand.

FULLER.—Intending, God willing, to return a true, clear, and short answer to the Introduction, I conceived it requisite to premise these few lines following.

The Animadvertor, like a cunning market-man, hath put his best corn in the top of his sack, to invite chapmen to buy it. His Preface hath a decoction of his whole book; which was advisedly done by him, hoping that those might read his Preface whom he suspected would never peruse his Book.

Reader, as I am loath any thing in his book should not be once answered, so be not offended, if, to avoid repetition, I am loath it should be twice answered. Each particular in the Preface will recur in the body of the Book; where, by God's assistance, no emphatical word nor syllable shall pass without its respective reply.

Nor hath the reader any cause to suspect, that, by such shifting, I intend any evasion, by pleading in the Preface that I will answer objections in the body of my Book, and alleging in the body of my Book that I have answered them in the Preface. For I have to do with the Animadvertor, so cunning and so exacting a merchant, that it is impossible for one indebted unto him to escape, without full payment, by changing the place of his habitation.

However, the Animadvertor hath dealt severely (to say no worse) with me; who, to render me the more culpable, and my book of the less credit, hath represented all my faults in a duplicating glass. And whereas the Best of Beings *non bis judicat in id ipsum*, "doth not punish the same faults twice," he hath twice taxed every supposed mistake in my History, once in his Preface, and again in the body of his Book.

DR. HEYLIN.—Concerning which the reader is to understand, that, in the year 1642, Mr. Fuller published his book called "The Holy State;" in the preface whereof he lets us know, that he should "count it freedom to serve two apprenticeships (God spinning out the thick thread of his life so long) in writing the Ecclesiastical History from Christ's time to our days." And so much time it seems he had spent upon it, (excepting some starts for recreation in the "Holy Land,") before he had finished and exposed it to public view; the book not coming out until the year 1655; whether agreeable to his promise and such a tedious expectation, we are now to see.

FULLER.—My words are by the Animadvertor given-in defectively, and (as to me) disadvantageously; this passage (which ought to have been inserted) immediately preceding my promise:—"If I may be so happy as to see these gloomy days disclouded with the beams of God's mercy."

I appeal to the conscience of the Animadvertor himself, whether in his soul he conceiveth these days disclouded or no. Gloomy they were when I wrote those words, before any war rained in the land; and since such bloody showers have ended, they continue lowering, gloomy, and dark unto this day.

My promise therefore being thus but conditional, and the condition on which it was grounded not as yet performed, I have no need, *liberare fidem*, "to free my faith," which was never bound, though I had ever since utterly quitted all thoughts of writing any Church-History.

For the first five years, during our actual civil wars, I had little list or leisure to write; fearing to be made an History, and shifting daily for my safety. All that time I could not *live to study*, who did only *study to live*.

So soon as God's goodness gave me a fixed habitation, I composed my "Land of Canaan, or Pisgah-Sight." This, though I confess it be no part of church-building, yet it is the clearing of the floor or foundation thereof, by presenting the performances of Christ and his apostles in Palestine. I perceive the Animadvertor "hath a month's mind" to give me a jeer, for my sallying into the Holy-Land; which I can bear the better, seeing (by God's goodness) that my book hath met with general reception, likely to live when I am dead; so that friends of quality solicit me to teach it the Latin language.

DR. HEYLIN.—For, First, the reader might expect, by the former passage, that he designed the general history of the church, from the first preaching of Christ, and the calling of the twelve apostles, to the times we live in: Whereas he hath restrained himself to the church of Britain, which he conceives to be so far from being founded in the time of Christ, that he is loath to give it the antiquity of being the work of any of the apostles, of any of the seventy disciples, or finally of any apostolical spirit of those eldest times.

FULLER.—"Charity begins, but doth not end, at home." The same method was embraced in my Church-History. It began with our own domestic affairs, to confute that accusation, commonly charged on Englishmen, that they are very knowing in foreign parts, but ignorant in their own country. I intended (God willing) to have proceeded to foreign churches; but I am discouraged by the causeless cavilling at what I have written already.

My Church-History beginneth (for point of time) *indeterminately*, before the birth of Christ, (lapping in, or folding over, part of Paganism,) and presenteth the doleful condition of the Britons, whilst yet unconverted, and grievous idolaters.

*Determinately*, my History begins *Anno Domini 37*; which is but four years after Christ's passion, and that is very early, I assure you: Christianity in this island being a timely riser, to be up so soon, and dressing itself, whilst as yet (and many years after) most countries were fast asleep in pagan impiety.

I deny not but that apostolical men were the first founders of religion in our land. But as for such apostles, (St. Peter, St. Paul, &c.,) who, without probability of truth, and against proportion of time, are by some authors obtruded on us, those I do reject, (I hope, without the least fault,) rendering my reasons for the same.

DR. HEFLIN.—And, Secondly, though he entitle it by the name of “The Church-History of Britain,” yet he pursues not his design agreeable to that title neither: there being little said of the affairs of the church of Scotland, which certainly makes up a considerable part of the isle of Britain; and less, if any thing at all, of the church of Ireland, which anciently passed in the account of a British island.

FULLER.—I will render the reader a true account, why I entituled my book “The Church-History of Britain.”

First. “The Church-History of England,” I might not call it; the five first centuries therein belonging wholly to the Britons before the name and notion of England was ever heard of in any author.

Secondly. “The Church-History of Great Britain,” I did not call it; for fear of bringing in Scotland within the latitude thereof, —a compass too large for my weak endeavours.

Thirdly. “The Church-History of Britain,” I did and might call it, in a double respect, *tam parte majore, quàm meliore*, “both from the bigger and better,” the fairer and fruitfuller part of Britain, the ecclesiastical affairs whereof were therein contained.

Yea, the Animadvertor knows full well, that the south of this island, by way of eminence, is so called. To give one instance of many from the title-page of a passage of state:—

*Nobilissima disceptatio super dignitate et magnitudine Regnorum Britannici et Gallici, habita ab utriusque Oratoribus et Legatis, in Concilio Constantiensi:—LOVANIÆ, anno 1517, typis excusa.*

“The most noble Dispute about the Dignity and Greatness of the Kingdoms of Britain and France, betwixt the Ambassadors and Legates of both sides, in the Council of Constance;” and “*anno 1517, printed at Lovaine.*”

Here the contest only was betwixt the crowns of England (here termed Britain) and France, Scotland not at all interesting itself therein.

It will not be long before the Animadvertor (as, God willing, in due time shall be observed) stickleth with might and main, that

Lucius might properly style himself, and be styled, King of Britain, who had not an half of the southern half of this island : and therefore, by his own principles, it is no solecism in me to name the Cis-Tweedan moiety thereof BRITAIN.

Had I given my native country a narrow and restrictive name, I had deserved due reproof; but now, measuring the denomination thereof with all honourable advantage, I humbly conceive myself not to fall under just reprehension for the same.

DR. HEYLIN.—Nor is it, Thirdly, a “Church-History” rightly and properly so called, but an aggregation of such and so many heterogeneous bodies, that ecclesiastical affairs make the least part of it. Abstracted from the dress and trimming, and all those outward embellishments which appear upon it, it hath a very fit resemblance to that lady of pleasure of which Martial tells us, *Pars minima est ipsa puella sui*, that “the woman was the least part of herself.” The name of a “Church-Rhapsody” had been fitter for it; though, to say truth, (had it been answerable thereunto in point of learning,) it might have passed by the old title of “*Fuller's Miscellanies*.” For such and so many are the impertinencies as to matters of historical nature, more as to matters of the church, that without them this great volume had been brought to a narrower compass, if it had taken up any room at all. So that we may affirm of the present History, as one did of the writings of Chrysippus an old philosopher, namely: *Si quis tollat e Chrysippi libris quæ aliena sunt, facile illi vacua relinquerentur pergamena*,\* that is to say, that “if they were well purged of all such passages as were not pertinent to the business which he had in hand, there would be nothing left in them to fill up his parchments.”

FULLER.—The Animadvertor hath a free liberty to name his own books; and I crave the same leave myself to denominate my own.

Before he had fallen so fiercely on my extravagancies in the Church-History, he had done well to have defended his own, in his “Geography;” sixteen parts of twenty therein being merely historical, and aliene from his subject in the strictness thereof. Sure I am, Ptolemy, Strabo, Pliny, &c. in their several descriptions of the world, have nothing to countenance the excursions about the pedigrees of princes, not reductive to Geography without the great favour of the reader so to understand it.

But, because recrimination is no part of purgation, I provide myself to answer to all which shall be objected for impertinencies.

2. DR. HEYLIN.—The first of this kind which I am to note, is a mere extrinsecal and outside unto those impertinencies which are

\* *DIODEGENES LAERTIUS in Vitâ Chrysippi.*

couched within : consisting of Title-pages, Dedicatory-Epistles, and several intermediate inscriptions unto every section ; a new way, never travelled before by any, till he found it out ; and such wherein he is not like to find many followers, though the way be opened. I know it is no unusual thing for works of different arguments, published at several times, and dedicated to several persons, to be drawn together into one volume ; and, being so drawn together, to retain still those particular titles and dedications which at first they had. But I dare confidently say, that our historian is the first, who, writing a book of the same argument, not published by piece-meal, as it came from his hand, but in a full and entire volume, hath filled his sheets with so many title-leaves and dedications, as we have before us.

FULLER.—I answer, First : Although it be unlawful even for the owner himself, *abuti re suâ*, “to abuse what is his own,” because the public hath an interest therein ; yet, is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own ? Matt. v. 10.

Secondly. The Animadvertor pretendeth in his notes to rectify “mistakes, falsities, and defects ;” this cometh not under any of these notions. And whereas he writeth, as he saith, “for the vindication of the truth, church, and injured clergy ;” by my dedicating of my book to many patrons, the truth is not prejudiced, nor the church wronged, nor any of the clergy injured.

Thirdly. Of late some useful and costly books, when past their parents’ power to bring them forth, have been delivered to the public, by the midwifery of such dedications.

Fourthly. Many (if not most) of my patrons invited themselves purposely to encourage my endeavours ; and why should any man’s “eye be evil,” because theirs were “good unto me ?”

Lastly. It is all one in effect, whether one printeth his dedications to many patrons, or whether one presenteth a printed “History of St. George,” to each English Knight of the Garter, with a written letter prefixed to every one of them : \* save that the former way is better, as which rendereth the author’s gratitude the more public and conspicuous.

DR. HEYLIN.—For in this one book, taking in “The History of Cambridge,” which is but an appendix to it, there are no fewer than twelve particular titles, beside the general ; as many particular dedications ; and no fewer than fifty-eight or sixty of those by-inscriptions, which are addressed to his particular friends and benefactors ; which make it bigger by forty sheets at the least, than it had been otherwise. Nay, so ambitious he is of increasing the number of his patrons, that, having but four leaves to come to the end of his History, he finds out a particular benefactress to inscribe it to : which brings into my mind the

\* As, to the earls of Lindsey, Danby, &c. which I have seen under the hand of the Animadvertor.



vanity of Vitellius in bestowing, and of Roscius Regulus for accepting, the consular dignity, for that part of the day on which Cecinna, by order and decree of the senate, was, degraded from it: of which the historian gives this note, that it was, *magno cum irrisu accipientis tribuentisque*, a matter of no mean disport amongst the people for a long time after.

FULLER.—Ordinary dedications exceed not a dozen lines, and therefore I believe the Animadvertor is much mistaken in his proportions.

If I did dedicate four leaves to a distinct patroness, no such fault therein; seeing, I am confident, those four leaves contain in them so remarkable an accident, as the Animadvertor never read the like in four thousand leaves of any historian.

DR. HEYLIN.—But of this argument our author heard so much at the late Act at Oxford, that I shall say no more of it at this present time.

FULLER.—I heard nothing thereof at Oxford, being then sixty miles distanced thence. Sure I am, I did not there *malè audire* deservedly, and if undeservedly, *mala fama benè parta delectat*.

Secondly. I have heard since, that one in the Act was bold to play on my own name and Church-History. But, for the seventeen years I lived in Cambridge, I never heard any Prevaricator mention his senior by name: we count such particularizing beneath an University.

Thirdly. I hope it will not be accounted pride, but prudence, in me, to believe myself above such trifles, who have written a book to eternity.

Fourthly. I regret not to be [the] anvil for any ingenious hammer to make pleasant music on; but it seems my traducer was not so happy.

Lastly. I remember a speech of sir Walter Raleigh: "If any," saith he, "speaketh against me to my face, my tongue shall give him an answer; but my back-side is good enough to return to him, who abuseth me behind my back."

3. DR. HEYLIN.—In the next rank of impertinencies, which are more intrinsecal, part of the substance of the work, I account his heraldry, blazons of arms, descents of noble families with their achievements intermingled as they come in his way; not pertinent, I am sure, to a Church-Historian, unless such persons had been founders of episcopal sees or religious houses, or that the arms so blazoned did belong to either.

FULLER.—I answer in general: Those passages of heraldry are put in for variety and diversion, to refresh the wearied reader.

They are never used without asking of leave before, or craving pardon after the inserting thereof; and such *craving* is *having* a request in that kind with the ingenuous. Grant it ill-manners in the author not to ask, it is ill-nature in the reader not to grant, so small a suit.

Mr. Camden, in his description of Oxfordshire, hath a prolix (though not tedious) poem, of the marriage of Thame and Isis, which he ushereth in with, *Si placet, vel legas vel negligas*, "Read or reject;" either set by it, or set it by; as the reader is disposed.

The same, though not expressed, is implied in all such digressions, which may be said to be left unprinted, in effect, to such as like them not: their ploughs may make balks of such deviations, and proceed to more serious matter.

DR. HEYLIN.—Our author tells us, that knowledge in the laws of this land "is neither to be expected nor required in one of his profession;" (vol. ii. p. 45;) and yet, I trow, considering the great influence which the laws have upon church-matters, the knowledge of the law cannot be so unnecessary in the way of a clergyman, as the study of heraldry. But, granting heraldry to be an ornament in all them that have it, yet is it no ingredient requisite to the composition of an ecclesiastical history. The copies of Battle-Abbey roll, fitter for Stow and Hollinshead, (where before we had them,) can, in an History of the Church, pretend to no place at all; though possibly the names of some may be remembered, as their foundations or endowments of churches give occasion for it. The arms of the knights errant, billeted in the isle of Ely, by the Norman Conqueror, is of like extravagancy. Such also is the catalogue of those noble adventurers, (with their arms, issue, and achievements,) who did accompany king Richard I. to the war of Palestine; which might have better served as an appendix to his "History of the Holy War," than found a place in the main body of an History of the Church of England: which three alone, besides many intercalations of that kind in most parts of the book, make up eight sheets more, inserted only for the ostentation of his skill in heraldry, in which notwithstanding he hath fallen on as palpable errors as he hath committed in his History.

FULLER.—Mr. Fox in his "Acts and Monuments" hath done the like, presenting the names of such who came over at the Norman Conquest. I have only made their catalogue more complete. And seeing it was preserved in Battle-Abbey, the very addition of "Abbey" doth dye it with some ecclesiastical tincture.

The arms of the knights of Ely might on a three-fold title have escaped the Animadvertor's censure: First. They were never before printed. Secondly, The wall whereon they were depicted, is now demolished. Lastly. Each knight being *blended* (or as I may say,

*empaled*) with a monk, a moiety of that mixture may be construed reducible to Church-History.

As for the arms of some signal persons achieved in the Holy War; if the surname of "War" be secular, the Christian name thereof, "Holy," is ecclesiastical; and so rendered all actions therein within the latitude of Church-History, to an ingenuous reader.

DR. HEYLIN.—For besides those which are observed in the course of this work, I find two others of that kind in his "History of Cambridge," to be noted here. For, he telleth us, (page 205,) that "Alice countess of Oxford was daughter and sole heir of Gilbert lord Samford, which Gilbert was hereditary Lord Chamberlain of England."—But, by his leave, Gilbert lord Samford was never the hereditary Chamberlain of the realm of England, but only Chamberlain in Fee to the queens of England; betwixt which offices how vast a difference there is, let our author judge.

FULLER.—I plead in my own defence, (according to my last General Answer,) that I have charged my margin with my author, Mr. Parker,\* Fellow of Caius College in Cambridge, one known for a most noble antiquary, but especially in heraldry; and I thought that he had lightened on some rare evidence, out of the ordinary road: but, seeing he was mistaken, I will amend it (God willing) in my next edition.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, Secondly, the honour of Lord Chamberlain of England came not unto the earls of Oxford by that marriage, or by any other, but was invested in that family, before they had attained the title and degree of earls: conferred by king Henry I. on Aubrey de Vere, a right puissant person, and afterwards on Aubrey de Vere his son, together with the earldom of Oxford, by king Henry II.† continuing hereditary in that house, till the death of Robert duke of Ireland, the ninth earl thereof, and then bestowed for a time at the king's discretion, and at last settled by king Charles in the house of Lindsey.

FULLER.—This is nothing confutatory of me, who never affirmed that the High-Chamberlainship accrued to the house of Oxford by any such match.

DR. HEYLIN.—But because, being a Cambridge-man, he may be better skilled in the earls of that county, let us see what he saith of them; and we shall find, that "Richard Plantagenet, duke of York, was the eighth earl of Cambridge." (Hist. of Camb. p. 226.) Whereas, First, Richard duke of York was not earl of Cambridge.

FULLER.—He was, he was, he was; as presently (God willing) will appear, beyond all doubt and contradiction.

\* In his *Skeleton Cantab.* MS.

† CAMDEN, in Oxford, fol. 389.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, Secondly, if he had been such, he must have been the seventh earl, and not the eighth. For thus those earls are marshalled in our “Catalogues of Honour,” and books of heraldry; namely, 1. William de Meschines. 2. John de Hainault. 3. William marquess of Juliers. 4. Edmond of Langley, duke of York. 5. Edward duke of York. 6. Richard de Conisburgh, younger brother of Edward. 7. James marquess Hamilton, &c.

FULLER.—Indeed, they are thus reckoned up in a late little (and useful) book, entitled, “The Help of History,” made (as I am credibly informed) by the Animadvertor himself; and therefore by him well styled “our Catalogues of Honour.” But more exact heralds, whom it concerns to be skilful in their own profession, do otherwise accunt them.

DR. HEYLIN.—No Richard duke of York to be found amongst them; his father, Richard of Conisburgh, having lost that title by attainder which never was restored to Richard his son, (though most improvidently advanced to the dukedom of York,) nor unto any other of that line and family.

FULLER.—I admire the Animadvertor’s peremptoriness in this point, when the no less learned (but more modest) Mr. Camden, speaking of these earls in the description of Cambridgeshire, saith, that, after the death of Richard of Conisburgh, “The title of the earl of Cambridge, either wholly vanished with him, or else lay hid amongst the titles of Richard his son, who was restored duke of York, as kinsman and heir to his uncle Edward duke of York.”

What he warily said “lay hid,” is found out by such as since wrote on that subject; Mr. Brooke, York herald, and Mr. Augustine Vincent, (in effect, Mr. Camden revised,) who writing corrections on Brooke, concurræth with him in this particular:—“For Richard of Conisburgh, Edward’s brother, was after created earl of that place, [Cambridge,] and after him another Richard, who was Richard of Conisburgh’s son.”\* See, reader, what an adversary I have gotten, who careth not to write against the most evident and avowed truths, so be it he may write something against me.

4. DR. HEYLIN.—Proceed we, in the next place, to verses, and old ends of poetry, scattered and dispersed in all parts of the History, from one end to the other; for which he hath no precedent in any historian, Greek or Latin, or any of the national Histories of these latter times. The Histories of Herodotus, Xenophon, Thucydides, and Plutarch, amongst the Greeks; of Cæsar, Livy, Sallust, Tacitus, and Suetonius, amongst the Latins; afford him neither warrant nor

example for it. The like may be affirmed of Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Ruffin, and Evagrius, Church-Historians all; though they had all the best choice, and the most excellent poets of the world to befriend them in it: and he that shall consult the Histories of succeeding times, through all the ages of the church to this present day, will find them all as barren of any encouragements in this kind as the ancients were.

FULLER.—Never had Herodotus given his nine books the names of the nine Muses, if such was his abstemiousness from poetry. Not one of them, which is ἀσύμβολος in this kind; and there are found in Clio, the first, no fewer than thirty verses of the oracles of Pythia. As those his books are fruitful, so his book of the Life of Homer hath a superfetation of them; so that if prose be the warp, verses are the woof thereof. Whereas the Animadvertor instances in Plutarch; open at the Life of Theseus, and we are presented with poetry therein.

But, grant no precedent in this nature in these authors; a more free genius acteth in modern than in ancient historians, manumitted from the servilities they were tied (or tied themselves) unto. The Animadvertor, like another Empson, endeavoureth to revive the penal statutes of history against me, (so to subject me to fine for the breach thereof,) which time in effect hath cancelled.

*Qui scribit historicè, scribit miserè*, if enslaved to all punctilios thereof. Let the Animadvertor keep those steel bodices for his own wearing, and not force them on me. What! not a plait or a ruffle, more or less, but all must be done in number, weight, and measure! according to historical criticism! This is not putting the book, but the author himself, into the press.

Tacitus himself (here instanced in) would be *tacitus* indeed, if all politic sentences and prudential results were deleted in him, being trespasses on the preciseness of history, confined to matter of fact. But well fare that historian who will go out of his own way, to direct his reader.

We know Pliny, Solinus, &c., in their topographical description of countries, are barren of verses. Let the Animadvertor, on the same account, therefore, charge Mr. Camden for surcharging his Britannia with poetry, having but three verseless shires, (namely, Dorset, Bucks, and Westmoreland,) in all England, and more than fourscore verses a-piece in the three several counties of Berks, Oxford, and Somerset.

DR. HEYLIN.—Nay, whereas bishop Godwin, in his "Annals," gives us an epitaph of two verses only made on queen Jane Seymour, and afterwards a copy of eighteen verses on the martyrdom of archbishop Cranmer; he ushers in the last with this short apology: *Contra*

*morem Historiæ liceat, quæso, inserere &c.* “Let me,” saith he, “I beseech you, insert these following verses, though otherwise against the rule and laws of History.”—*Annal. Reginæ Mariæ.*

FULLER.—What, if that worthy prelate was pleased to pass a compliment on his reader! it followeth not that they do want civility, who have less courtship in this point than he hath. Let us look on his “Catalogue of Bishops,” which hath more vicinity with my subject; and there we shall find (the bulk of the book considered) more verses in proportion, than in my Church-History, on the token that where I cite but four, he quoteth fourteen, out of Martial, to prove Claudia Ruffina a Briton and a Christian.

DR. HEYLIN.—But what, alas! were eighteen or twenty verses, compared with those many hundred, (six or seven hundred at the least,) which we find in our author, whether to show the universality of his reading in all kind of writers, or his faculty in translating, (which when he meets with hard copies, he knows how to spare,) I shall not determine at the present.

FULLER.—If pieces of verses be counted whole ones, which in this point is no charitable synecdoche, and if translations be reckoned distinct verses, though it is hard that a man and his shadow should be accounted two different persons:—

And if the verses in the “History of Cambridge” be adjected, though he who banisheth poetry out of an University will find iambs enough to pay him for his pains:—

And if the verses in the “History of Waltham-Abbey” be cast in, (though who shall hinder, but I will describe my own parish in prose or poetry as I think fit?) all, put together, will not amount to the number.

Besides, many of my verses may be said to be prose in effect, as containing the religion of that age, and therefore alleged as evidence thereof, before the Norman Conquest; and no authority can in prose be produced which doth so fully and clearly represent the same.

Other verses are generally epitaphs on some eminent churchmen, which could not well be omitted.

DR. HEYLIN.—Certain I am, that, by the interlarding of his prose with so many verses, he makes the book look rather like a Church-Romance, (our late romancers being much given to such kind of mixtures,) than a well-built Ecclesiastical History. And if it be a matter so inconvenient to put a new piece of cloth on an old garment; the putting of so many old patches on a new piece of cloth must be more unfashionable. Besides that, many of these old ends are so light and ludicrous, so little pertinent to the business which he has in hand,

that they serve only to make sport for children, (*ut pueris placeas, et declamatio fias,*) and for nothing else.

FULLER.—Had the Animadvertor come with a good stomach, such larding had been no bad cookery. Certain I am that a comment admitteth less latitude in this kind than a Church-History. Certain I am also, that a “Comment on the Creed” is allowed less liberty than other comments. Now the Animadvertor hath bescattered *his* every where with verses and translations. It consisteth not with my charity to miscall it “a Creed-Romance,” accounting it a sin so to decry or disparage his useful endeavours. The best way to discover the deformity of my fabric, is for the Animadvertor to erect a more beautiful building hard by it; that so his rare and regular, may shame my rude, piece of architecture.

What, if such mixtures make the garment (which also I utterly deny) to be less in the fashion, the fondling of fancy? I made it not for sight but service, that it might be strong and warm to the wearers thereof.

I stand on my justification, that no such light or ludicrous verses are to be found in my book, which render it [liable] to just exception. But no wonder if the bell clinketh even as the prejudiced hearer thinketh thereof.

5. DR. HEYLIN.—This leads me to the next impertinency,—his raking into the channel of old popish legends, written in the darker times of superstition, but written with an honest zeal, and a good intention, as well to raise the reader to the admiration of the person of whom they write, as to the emulation of his virtues. But, being mixed with some monkish dotages, the most learned and ingenious men in the church of Rome have now laid them by; and it had been very well if our author had done so too, but that there must be something of entertainment for the gentle reader, and to inflame the reckoning which he pays not for.

FULLER.—I have not raked into the kennel of old popish legends, who took the clearest water, in this kind, out of those rivers which run, at this day, in highest reputation with the Romanists. I never cited any legend but either out of Harpsfield, who wrote in the last generation, and was as ingenuous as any of his persuasion; or else out of HIEROM PORTER'S *Flores Sanctorum*, who wrote some forty years, [ago,] and in high esteem with the papists at this day, as appears by the dear price thereof.

I confess, I have instanced (taking ten perchance out of ten thousand) in the grossest of them, (that is the fairest monster which is most deformed,) partly to show what a spirit of delusion acted in that age, partly to raise our gratitude to God, seeing such lying vanities are now ridiculous even to children.



I believe not the Animadvertor, when saying, that "the most learned and ingenious of Rome have laid them aside," seeing Cornelius à Lapide weaveth them in all along his "Comments," and king James did justly complain, that Bellarmine himself did mar his "pretty books of devotion with such legendary mixtures."

DR. HEYLIN.—But, above all things, recommend me to his merry tales, and scraps of trencher-jests, frequently interlaced in all parts of the History; which, if abstracted from the rest, and put into a book by themselves, might very well be served up for a second course to the "Banquet of Jests," a supplement to the old book, entituled, "Wits, Fits, and Fancies;" or an additional century to the old "Hundred Merry Tales," so long since extant. But standing as they do, they neither do become the gravity of a Church-historian, nor are consistent with the nature of a sober argument.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor should have rendered me liable to just reproof, by instancing in one of those tales so inconsistent with the gravity of a Church-Historian; which no doubt he had done, but because he knew himself unable to produce it.

He who is often seen to snap hastily at, and feed hungrily on, a hard crust, will not be believed, if bragging that he can eat pheasants and partridges at his pleasure. And seeing the Animadvertor doth commonly carp and cavil at the silly shadows of seeming mistakes in my book, it is utterly improbable he can, yet will not, charge me with a fault which cannot be defended.

But let him at leisure produce the most light and ludicrous story in all my book, and here I stand ready to parallel it with as light, (I say not in the Animadvertor, but) in as grave authors as ever put pen to paper.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, as it seems, our author came with the same thoughts to the writing of this present History, as poets anciently addressed themselves to the writing of comedies, of which thus my Terence :—

*Poeta cum primum animum ad scribendum appulit,  
Id sibi negotii credidit solum dari,  
Populo ut placerent quas fecisset fabulas.*

That is to say,

"Thus poets when their mind they first apply  
In looser verse to frame a comedy,  
Think there is nothing more for them to do,  
Than please the people, whom they speak unto."

FULLER.—I admire that the Animadvertor, who so lately had taxed me for writing and translating of verses, will now do the same himself. There is a double people-pleasing: one sordid and servile, made of falsehood and flattery, which I defy and detest: the

other lawful, when men deliver and dress truth in the most plausible expression. I have a precedent above exception to warrant it, even Solomon himself: "The preacher sought out acceptable words," Eccles. xii. 10. This I did and will aim at, in all my writings; and I doubt not but that the Animadvertor's stationer doth hope and desire, that he hath thus pleased people in his book, for the advancing of the price and quickening the sale thereof.

6. DR. HEYLIN.—In the last place, proceed we to the manifold excursions about the antiquity of Cambridge, built on as weak authority as the monkish legends, and so impertinent to the matter which he hath in hand, that the most reverend Matthew Parker, (though a Cambridge-man,) in his *Antiquitates Britannicæ*, makes no business of it.

The more impertinent, in regard that at the fag-end of his book there follows a distinct History of that University, to which all former passages might have been reduced.

But, as it seems, he was resolved to insert nothing in that History but what he had some probable ground for; leaving the legendary part thereof to the Church-Romance, as most proper for it. And, certainly, he is wondrous wise in his generation.

For, fearing lest he might be asked for those Bulls and Chartularies which frequently he relates unto in the former books, he tells us in "the History of Cambridge," page 83, That they were burnt by some of the seditious townsmen in the open market-place, *anno* 1380, or thereabouts: so that, for want of other ancient evidence, we must take his word; which whether those of Cambridge will depend upon, they can best resolve.

For my part, I forbear all intermeddling in a controversy so clearly stated, and which hath lain so long asleep, till now awakened by our author to beget new quarrels. Such passages in that History as come under any "Animadversion," have been reduced unto the other, as occasion served; which the reader may be pleased to take notice of as they come before him.

FULLER.—Because omitted by archbishop Parker, I have the more cause and reason to insert it: otherwise, had he handled the subject before, the Animadvertor would have cried out, "*Crambe*," that there was nothing novel therein.

Call it (I pray) "*the fringe*" of my book, be it but for the subject's sake whereof it treats, my dear mother, the University of Cambridge.

I live in the same generation with the Animadvertor, and I hope shall acquit myself as honest, which truly is as wise, as himself. "Church-Romance!" *Parcius ista*.

As I tell the reader of the burning of those original charters, so in the same place I charge my margin with my author, (Dr. Caius,) and thereby discharge myself.

Doth the Animadvertor now “forbear all intermeddling” therein “in this controversy?” Why did he not forbear before, when setting forth his last Geography some five years since? And is it not as lawful for me to defend, as for him to oppose, my mother? When, where, and by whom, was this “controversy so clearly stated?” Was it by the Animadvertor himself? Such a party is unfit for a judge. Or was it stated by the Parliament mentioned by him *primo Jacobi*, when, as he telleth us, the Clerk was commanded to place Oxford first. But, it plainly appears, it was not then so clearly decided but that the question was ever started again, in the late Long Parliament, with arguments on both sides. Witness the printed speech of sir Simonds D’Ewes on that occasion.

7. DR. HEYLIN.—All these extravagancies and impertinencies (which make up a fifth part of the whole volume) being thus discharged, it is to be presumed that nothing should remain but a mere Church-History, as the title promiseth. But let us not be too presumptuous on no better grounds.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor’s words mind me of a memorable passage, which hereafter he hath, in his Animadversions on my sixth book, or “History of Abbeys.”—“The intruder payeth to the sequestered minister but a nineteenth part instead of a fifth.” But if the fifth part, in relation to my book, be here stated to the same proportion for the nineteenth, yet will not the Animadvertor’s measure be reconciled to the standard of truth.

DR. HEYLIN.—For on a *melius inquirendum* into the whole course of the book which we have before us, we shall find too little of the church, and too much of the state; I mean, too little of the ecclesiastical, and too much of the civil, History. It might be reasonably expected, that in a History of the Church of England, we should have heard somewhat of the foundation and enlargement of cathedral churches, if not of the more eminent monasteries and religious houses; and that we should have heard somewhat more of the succession of bishops in their several and respective sees, their personal endowments, learned writings, and other acts of piety, magnificence, and public interest, especially when the times afforded any whose names in some of those respects deserved to be retained in everlasting remembrance.

FULLER.—I doubt not but the reader who hath perused my Church-History, will bear me witness, that therein there is a competent representation of all these particulars, so far forth as the proportion of the book will bear.

DR. HEYLIN.—It might have been expected also, that we should have found more frequent mention of the calling of national and pro-

vincial synods, with the result of their proceedings, and the great influence which they had on the civil state, sparingly spoken of at the best, and totally discontinued, in a manner, from the death of king Henry IV. until the Convocation of the year 1552; of which no notice had been taken, but that he had a mind to question the authority of "the Book of Articles" which came out that year, though published as the issue and product of it, by the express warrant and command of king Edward VI.

FULLER.—All councils before the Conquest, with their canons, are completely (and the most remarkable after it) represented in my History. With what face can the Animadvertor say, that I have discontinued the Acts of the Convocation till the year 1552? the acts of one critical Convocation in the 27th of Henry VIII. 1535, taking up no less than eight sheets in my book, and another in the same king's reign employing more than a sheet!

DR. HEYLIN.—No mention of that memorable Convocation in the fourth and fifth years of Philip and Mary, in which the clergy, taking notice of an Act of Parliament then newly passed, by which the subjects of the temporality, having lands to the yearly value of five pounds and upwards, were charged with finding horse and armour, according to the proportion of their yearly revenues and possessions, did by their sole authority, as a Convocation, impose upon themselves, and the rest of the clergy of this land, the finding of a like number of horses, armour, and other necessities for the war, according to their yearly income, proportion for proportion, and rate for rate, as by that statute had been laid on the temporal subjects.

FULLER.—I am confident that this is the self-same Convocation which is thus entered in my Church-History, book viii. vol. 2, page 425. *Anno 1557, quinto Mariæ.*—"The clergy gave the queen a subsidy of eight shillings in the pound, (confirmed by Act of Parliament,) to be paid in four years. In requital whereof, by Pole's procurement, the queen privileged them from showing their horses with the laity; yet so that they should muster them up for the defence of the land, under captains of their own choosing."

I cannot therefore be justly charged with no mention of the Acts of this Convocation.

DR. HEYLIN.—And this they did by their own sole authority, as before was said, ordering the same to be levied on all such as were refractory, by sequestration, deprivation, suspension, excommunication, —ecclesiastical censures all; without relating to any subsequent confirmation by Act of Parliament, which they conceived they had no need of.

FULLER.—I took the less notice of, and gave the less heed to, the transactions of the clergy therein, because then they were in

their huff and height, furious with fire and faggot ; so that all done by them *de facto* cannot be justified for legal ; who sometimes borrowed a point of law (even with intent never to repay it) in their proceedings. It may be proved out of Mr. Fox, that some at that time (by a cruel prolepsis) antedated the burning of some Martyrs, before the writ *de hæretico comburendo* came unto them. Wherefore all their actions in that time are not precedential to warrant posterity, and the air of that torrid zone will not fit the bodies in our temperate climate.

DR. HEYLIN.—Nor find we any thing of the Convocations of queen Elizabeth's time, except that of the year 1562, (and that not fairly dealt with neither, as is elsewhere showed,) though there passed many canons in the Convocation of the year 1571, and of the year 1585, and the year 1597, all printed, and still publicly extant ; besides the memorable Convocation of the year 1555, in which the clergy gave the queen a benevolence of two shillings in the pound, to be levied by ecclesiastical censures, without relating to any subsequent confirmation by Act of Parliament, as had accustomably been used in the grant of subsidies.

FULLER.—*Bernardus non vidit omnia* ; I could not come to the knowledge of every particular. But, I confess, I cannot conjecture the cause of the Animadvertor's retrograde motion, who, after so many years in the reign of queen Elizabeth, goeth back again to the year 1555 ; which was four years before she came to the crown.

DR. HEYLIN.—It might have been expected also that we should have found in a "Church-History of Britain," the several degrees and steps by which the heterodoxies and superstitions of the church of Rome did creep in amongst us ; and the degrees by which they were ejected and cast out again, and the whole Reformation settled upon the doctrine of the apostles, attended by the rites and ceremonies of the primitive times.

FULLER.—I hope the peruser of my book will be sensible of no defect, but that the same in a good degree is performed by me on several occasions.

DR. HEYLIN.—As also that some honourable mention should be found of those gallant defences which were made by Dr. Bancroft, Dr. Bilson, Dr. Bridges, Dr. Cosins, and divers others, against the violent batteries and assaults of the Puritan faction in queen Elizabeth's time ; and of the learned writings of bishop Buckeridge, bishop Morton, Dr. Sutcliffe, Dr. Burgess, &c., in justification of the rites and ceremonies of the church of England, against the remnants of that scattered (and then broken) faction in the time of king James ; of which we have

*ne gry quidem*, “not a word” delivered. Nor could it stand with his design, (which will discover itself in part in this Introduction, and shall more fully be discovered in the “Animadversions,”) that it should be otherwise.

FULLER.—I answer: First. No drag-net can be so comprehensive as to catch all fish and fry in the river; I mean, no historian can descend to every particular.

Secondly. What, if I left that piece in the dish, for manners' sake? I must not engross all history to myself, but leave some to such as shall succeed me in the same subject.

Thirdly. The reader in perusing my book will bear me witness, that most of these have their true encomiums on the same account; and especially Dr. Bancroft, Dr. Bilson, Dr. Cosins.

Fourthly. If my omission of his book hath offended bishop Morton, my *asking* will be *having* the pardon of so vivacious a piety; who, being past the age of a man, now leads the life of an angel.

Lastly. I have a book of “the Lives of all English Worthies,” (God send it good success!) which had been in print, if not obstructed by the intervening of this contest; and, coming forth, will be suppletory of all such defects.

DR. HEYLIN.—All which together make it clear and evident, that there is too little of the Church or Ecclesiastical History in our author's book; and that there is too much of the state or civil history will be easily seen, by that unnecessary intermixture of state concerns, not pertinent to the business which he hath in hand.

FULLER.—I answer, First, in general: Such the sympathy betwixt the two embracing twins, church and state, that sometimes it is both painful and pity to part them; more particularly, such passages have at the least a cast or eye of church-colour in them; or else they are inserted for necessity, *ne detur vacuum*, for mere lack of church-matter. All the ecclesiastical history in Mr. Fox, during the reign of Edward IV. will not fill his hollow pen; the cause why he makes it up with history of the state; and I sometimes do the like. Lastly. It is done for variety, (and then, commonly, I crave the reader's leave,) which I hope is no offence. Must I turn schoolboy again, and the Animadvertor be my school-master, to give me a theme, that I must write on no other subject but what he appoints me?

DR. HEYLIN.—Of this sort, to look back no further, is the long Will and Testament of king Henry VIII. with his gloss or comment on the same, taking up three whole sheets at least; in which there is not any thing which concerns religion, or which relates unto the church or church affairs; although, to have the better colour to bring it in, he

tells us that he hath transcribed it, not only for the rarity thereof, but “because it contained many passages which might reflect much light upon our Church-History.” (Book v. vol. 2, p. 116.)

FULLER.—I answer, First: All ancient Wills have something of sacredness in them, beginning, “In the name of God, Amen.” Secondly. They are proved in the Court-Christian, which evidenceth something of ecclesiasticalness in them. Thirdly. Kings have ever been beheld as mixed persons, wherein church and state are blended together. Fourthly. The Will of king Henry VIII. in that active juncture of times, is more than the Will of an ordinary king. Fifthly. It is most remarkable even in Church History, if only on this account,—to show that he who had violated the testaments of so many founders and benefactors, had hardly any one particular of his own Will performed. Sixthly. It never was, and perchance (had I not done it) never had been, printed. Seventhly. False and imperfect copies thereof pass about in manuscript. Lastly. I have received so much thanks from the Animadvertor’s betters for printing of it, that I will freely pardon and pass by his causeless cavil against me for the same.

DR. HEYLIN.—Of this sort also is his description of the pomp and order of the coronation of king Charles, which though he doth acknowledge not to be within the pale and park of ecclesiastical history, yet he resolves to bring it in, because it comes within the purlieus of it, as his own words are. But for this he hath a better reason than we are aware of, that is to say: “But if hereafter Divine Providence shall assign England another king, though the transactions herein be not wholly precedential, something of state may be chosen out grateful for imitation.” (Church-History, book xi. vol. 3, p. 344.)

As if the pomp and order of a coronation were not more punctually preserved in the Heralds’ Office, who have the ordering of all things done without the church, (and are eye-witnesses of all which is done within,) than in our author’s second-hand and imperfect collections.

FULLER.—I answer, First: A coronation is church-work, performed therein by an archbishop, attended with prayers and a sermon.

Secondly. I never expected that a chaplain to king Charles should find fault with any thing tending to the honour of his lord. How can any good disciple grudge at what is expended *εἰς ἐνταφιασμόν*, “on the burial of the memory” of his master, being the last in this kind?

Thirdly. My “collections,” I mean printed by me, but observed by my most worthy friend, are (abating only the uncertain place of the lord mayor) most critically exact.

Lastly. Though the Heralds’ Office doth carefully preserve all



such ceremonies, yet cannot all persons living at great distance, and desiring information herein, have on all occasions so facile and convenient access to their office as to my printed book.

DR. HEYLIN.—The like may be said also of the quick and active reigns of king Edward VI. and queen Mary; in which the whole body of the Reformed religion was digested, settled, and destroyed; sufficient of itself to make a competent volume, but contracted by our author (like Homer's Iliads in the nut-shell) into less than twenty-five sheets: and yet in that small abstract we find many impertinences, as to the work he hath in hand; that is to say, the great proficiency of kind Edward in his grammar-learning, exemplified in three pieces of Latin of his making, when he was but eight or nine years old.

FULLER.—Just reason of such contraction, because of Mr. Fox's dilatation on the same. Where he found my fault, he (if so pleased) might have found my defence; namely, If papists preserve the nails and hairs of their supposed saints, give me leave to record the first essays of this pious prince, especially they being unprinted rarities, with which no divine or scholar, save the Animadvertor alone, would or could have found any fault.

DR. HEYLIN.—The long narrative of sir Edward Mountague, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, to vindicate himself from being a voluntary agent in the business of the lady Jane Grey (needlessly inserted.)

FULLER.—King Edward VI.'s passing the crown (over the heads of his two sisters) to his cousin the lady Jane, is a piece of Church-History; because the continuing of the protestant religion is all the plausible plea for the same, and the fair varnish of so foul a groundwork. This passage of consequence is defectively delivered by our Historians, some circumstances thereof being hitherto locked from the world: some have endeavoured to force the lock by their bold conjectures. I am the first that have brought the true key and opened it, from Judge Mountague's own hand, truly passive, (though charged to be most active therein,) driven with the tempest of duke Dudley's anger, against the tide of his own inclinations. I prize a dram of acceptance from the ingenuous reader, above a pound of the Animadvertor's cavilling: which is offended with my inserting of so authentic and informative a manuscript.

DR. HEYLIN. — (Needless.) The full and punctual relation of Wyatt's rebellion, and the issue of it, though acted upon some false grounds of civil interest, without relating to religion or to church affairs. *Infinitum esset ire per singula*, "It were an infinite labour to look into all particulars of this nature," which are found in our

author, and make up a great part of the book; but we may guess by this brief view, (as *ex pede Herculem*,) that his diversions upon civil matters and affairs of state, which neither have relation to nor any influence at all upon those of the church, do make up a considerable part of the rest of the book: which civil matters and state-concernments being discharged also, (as in all reason they ought to be,) we next proceed to the Church-History itself; in which, if we should make the like defalcation, and expunge every passage which is either positively false or ignorantly mistaken by him, there would be very little left to inform the reader, as by the following "Animadversions" will appear sufficiently.

FULLER.—This rebellion was grounded on erroneous principles of religion, and therefore Goodman (Ill-man!) did, in his book of that subject, entitle it "God's cause;" and, though foully mistaken therein, it is enough to reduce this design to church-concernment. Had I omitted it, the Animadvertor would have charged me with Puritanical (pardon the prolepsis) compliance; so hard it is to please him, either full or fasting.

8. DR. HEYLIN.—But well it were, if only aberrations from historical truth were to be met with in our author: in whom we find such a continual vein of Puritanism, such dangerous grounds for inconformity and sedition to be raised upon, as easily may pervert the unwary reader, whom the facetiousness of the style (like a hook baited with a painted fly) may be apt to work on. Murdering of kings avowed for a necessary prudence, as oft as they shall fall into the power of their subjects. (Ch. Hist. Lib. iv. vol. i. p. 417.)

FULLER.—The page cited by him happily happeneth to be the initial one of a section, and hath no more therein than as followeth:

"Soon after his death, king Edward was much lamented by those of whom in his lifetime he was never beloved. Whether this proceeded from the mere mutability of men's minds, weary to loiter long in the lazy posture of the same affection; or whether it proceeded from the pride of Mortimer, whose insolence grew intolerable; or whether it was because his punishment was generally apprehended to be too heavy for his fault; so that deposition without death, or, at the worst, death without such unhuman cruelty, had been sufficient.

"One of our English poet-historians acquainteth us with a passage, which, to my knowledge, appeareth not in other authors." (Church-History, book iv. vol. i. p. 417.)

This all in that page.

Reader, I request thee do me, thyself, and truth, right: Whether can my avowance of king-murdering be collected from any thing here written by me?

But because some will say, "The quotation possibly may be mistaken : " if any thing sounding to that sense, there or elsewhere, be found in my book, may "the ravens of the valleys," (whom I behold as loyal subjects,) in vindication of the eagle their sovereign, "pick out my eyes," for delivering such rebellious doctrine.

DR. HEYLIN.—(1.) The coronation of kings, and consequently their succession to the crown of England, made to depend upon the suffrage and consent of the people. (Book xi. vol. 3, p. 342.)

(2.) The sword extorted from the supreme magistrate, and put into the hands of the common people, whensoever the reforming humour shall grow strong amongst them. (Book ix. vol. 2, p. 439.)

(3.) The church deprived of her authority in determining controversies of the faith, and a dispute raised against that clause of the Article in which that authority is declared, whether forged or not. (Book ix. vol. 2, p. 470.)

FULLER.—(1.) *Stylus æquabilis!* Here is a continued campaign, large level, and fair flat, of fourteen untruths at least, without any elevation of truth interposed. No such matter in that place, as hereafter shall appear.

(2.) False as the former, as in due time and place (cited now, afterwards by him eagerly improved) will appear.

(3.) I am *depraved* unjustly, who never *deprived* the church of her authority. I raised no such dispute, but would have quelled it, if in my power. All which I refer to my answer to these respective quotations.

DR. HEYLIN.—Her power in making canons every where prostituted to the lust of the Parliament, contrary both to law and constant practice.

FULLER.—"Every where" is no where. And seeing no particular place is instanced, to a general charge a general denial shall suffice. Let me add, that, whereas the Animadvertor hereafter taxeth me for calling *the two houses* "the Parliament ; " \* we therefore may presume, that he (not running on the same rock) by *Parliament* meaneth "the king, lords, and commons : " which granted, how much of loyalty and discretion there is in these his words, "prostituted to the lust," let others judge.

DR. HEYLIN.—The heterodoxies of Wickcliffe canonized for gospel, and Calvin's opinions (whatsoever they were) declared for orthodox.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor's words are more than Apocrypha, even a very untruth.

\* *Vide infra*, part 3, "Appeal of Injured Innocence," No. 322.

DR. HEYLIN.—(1.) The sabbatarian rigours published for divine and ancient truths, though there be no antiquity nor divinity in them.

(2.) The hierarchy of bishops so coldly pleaded for, as shows he had a mind to betray the cause, &c.

FULLER.—(1.) Most false, as in due time and place shall abundantly appear.

(2.) *Weakly*, it may be, for lack of ability; not “coldly,” for want of affection. But, rather than the cause I so cordially wish well to should miscarry by my well-intended weakness, henceforward I will stand by, and resign my place at the bar to better pleaders in its behalf.

DR. HEYLIN.—Whilst all things pass on smoothly for the Presbyterians, whom he chiefly acts for: and this is that which we must look for, *par my et par tout*, as the Frenchmen say. Nor deals he otherwise with the persons which are brought before him, than he doth with the causes which they bring. No professed Puritan, no cunning Nonconformist, or open Separatist, comes upon the stage, whom he follows not with plaudits and some fair commends.

FULLER.—He means Mr. Cartwright, Travers, Stone, Udal, Greenham, Hildersham, Dod; all (though dissenting from the church in ceremonies) eminent in their generations. I commend them not for their nonconformity, but other qualities of piety, painfulness, learning, patience, &c. Doth not Mr. Camden give Babington (who suffered as a traitor to queen Elizabeth) the commendation of wealth, wit, learning, and handsomeness? \* Yea, doth not the Holy Spirit praise Absalom for his blameless beauty? and Achithophel for his oraculous wisdom? The worst of moral men may be commended for their naturals, and the worst of spiritual men for their morals.

DR. HEYLIN.—Whereas the Fathers of the church, and the conformable children of it, are sent off commonly in silence, and sometimes with censure.

FULLER.—The reader, by perusing my book, will find I have embalmed their memories with my best spices.

DR. HEYLIN.—The late archbishop of Canterbury, so eminently deserving of the church of England, must be raked out of his grave, arraigned for many misdemeanours, of which none could accuse him when he was alive; all his infirmities and weaknesses mustered up together, to make him hateful to the present and succeeding ages; when Mr. Love's treasonable practices and seditious speeches must needs (forsooth) be buried in the same earth with him.

FULLER.—I have in this my “Appeal” collected twenty-two

commendations of the archbishop out of my Church-History, and had made them up forty, save that the press prevented me. The best is, "what is lost in the hundred, is found in the shire;" I mean, may be (though not in this my defence) found in my book at large.

DR. HEYLIN.—(1.) The University of Oxford frequently quarrelled and exasperated, upon slight occasions.

(2.) The late king's party, branded by the odious title of "malig-nants," not bettered by some froth of pretended wit in the etymology.

FULLER.—(1.) When and where? Being now left at large, without any direction to the place, I am more troubled what my offence is, than what my defence shall be. I am sure the Animad-vertor, as a dutiful son to his mother, will in due time and place discover it, and, unwilling to antedate my own molestation, my answer is deferred (or rather referred) thereunto.

(2.) As for my using the term "malignant," in due time I shall make a satisfactory answer.

DR. HEYLIN.—The regular clergy shamefully reproached by the name of "covetous conformists." (Book ix. vol. 2, p. 497.)

FULLER.—Who would not think, but that (as the charge stand-eth against me) I had branded all conformists with the note of "covetous?" which had been an abominable scandal indeed. Whereas my words only relate to some particular persons: whom, if the Animadvertor will say they were conformists, (as indeed they were,) I dare swear, (if called thereunto,) that they were "covet-ous," as who, by unreasonable leases, (as the statute calleth them,) wasted the lands of the church, till they were seasonably retrenched by that wholesome law made [in] the 13th of Queen Elizabeth.

"Regular clergy" they might be, (as the Animadvertor termeth them,) in other things; but, in this particular, "regular" only to the rules of avarice; making such leases against reason and common equity, though, in the rigour of the then law, justifiable. I wonder that the Animadvertor will advocate for their actions, so detrimental to the church.

Nor doth this dash the least disgrace on conformity itself, they not doing it *qua* conformists. It was not their conformity made them covetous, (though perchance their covetousness might make them conformable,) but their own corruption.

But if the epithet of "covetous" be so offensive, I will, in my next edition, to mend the matter, change it into "sacrilegious con-formity," and justify my expression, according to the principle of the Animadvertor's own judgment, because they enriched themselves with impairing the goods of the church.

DR. HEYLIN.—And those poor men who were ejected by the late Long Parliament, despitefully called “Baal’s priests, unsavoury salt, not fit to be thrown upon the dunghill;” though he be doubtful of the proofs which were brought against them. (Book xi. vol. 3, p. 459.)

FULLER.—I have, at large, defended myself against this foul and false accusation, when the place cited doth occur.

DR. HEYLIN.—So many of all sorts wronged and injured by him, that should they all study their personal and particular revenges, he were not able to abide it; and therefore we may justly say, in the poet’s language:—

*Si de tot læsis sua numina quisque deorum  
Vindicet, in pœnas non satis unus erit.*

Which may be Englished in these words:—

“Should all wrong’d parties seek to’ avenge their fame,  
One man were not enough to bear the shame.”

FULLER.—If I stand indebted to so many for wronging of them, the fairest way is for them jointly to seize on what I have; that so my small estate may be shared amongst them all, so far as it will go, and every one have his proportion thereof. Whereas now, the Animadvertor taking all (and more than all) his pennyworths out of me, he hath injuriously dealt with the rest of the creditors thereby. However, I hope to appear responsible, (seeing no debt is soon satisfied,) and the Animadvertor himself in due time will be found in my debt, if all accounts be equally audited betwixt us.

This I dare boldly say, (though I confess his faults excuse not mine, if guilty,) that he hath wronged more and persons of higher quality, in his late books. Bishop James Montague, a known eminent scholar, vilified by an odious and indiscreet comparing him with another of his surname.

Judge Hutton and Crook scandalously abused by him for consenting privately to the ship-money, who as well privately (in the king’s presence) as publicly opposed it, though they subscribed their hands, in conformity to the greater number: as the Animadvertor, more knowing in law than myself, will acknowledge the common and constant custom in such cases. I could instance in many more; it being no discretion to play out all I have at once, but to keep a reserve in my hand, in case (which God forefend!) I should be provoked to another answer.

9. DR. HEYLIN.—But nothing does more evidently discover his unfaithful dealing, than his report of the proceedings in the Isle of Wight, between his majesty and the Long-Parliament divines; of which he tells us, that his majesty, in the last paper which he sent

them, "acknowledged their great pains to inform his judgment, according to their persuasions, and also took especial notice of their civilities of the application, both in the beginning and body of their reply;" (Book xi. vol. 3, p. 499;) and having cleared himself from some misunderstanding about the writ of partition which they speak of, puts an end to the business. The man who reads this passage cannot choose but think, that his majesty, being vanquished by the arguments of the Presbyterians, had given over the cause; and, therefore, as convicted in his conscience, rendereth them thanks for the instruction which he had received, and the civilities they used towards him in the way thereof. But he that looks upon his majesty's last paper, will find that he had learnedly and divinely refelled all their arguments; and having so done, puts them in mind of three questions which are proposed in his former paper, acknowledged by themselves to be of great importance in the present controversy; without an answer whereunto, his majesty declared that he would put an end to that conference: "It not being probable," as he told them, "that they should work much upon his judgment whilst they are fearful to declare their own, nor possible to relieve his conscience but by a free declaring of theirs." But they, not able, or not daring, (for fear of displeasing their great masters,) to return an answer to those questions, his majesty remained sole master of the field, a most absolute conqueror. For though the first blow commonly does begin the quarrel, it is the last blow always that gets the victory. But *regium est, cum benefeceris malè audire*: "It hath been commonly the fortune of the greatest princes, when they deserve best, to be worst reported."

FULLER.—Here I will truly acquaint the reader with the state of this matter. The posting press, which, with the time and tide, will stay for no man, mistaking my copy complete, and not attending my coming to London that morning from Waltham, clapt it up imperfect. I must therefore deservedly take all the blame and shame thereof on myself, and here in this sheet do public penance for the same, promising amendment to the full, God willing, in the next edition.

10. DR. HEYLIN.—Nor deals he better with the church, than he does with the king; concealing such things as might make for her justification, and advocating for such things as disturb her order. In the last book we find him speaking of some heats which were raised in the church, about placing the communion-table altar-wise, and great fault found for the want of moderation in those men who had the managing of that business. But he conceals his majesty's determination in the case of St. Gregory's, November 3, 1633; by which all bishops and other ordinaries were encouraged to proceed therein; and consequently those of inferior rank to defend their actings.

FULLER.—I have not full twenty lines on the whole subject,



being loath to enlarge on so odious a difference, sopited in good measure : and, as I durst not totally omit, so I passed it over with all possible brevity.

DR. HEYLIN.—The chapel of Emmanuel College in Cambridge is built north and south, contrary to the usage of the primitive times and the church of England ; with which king James being made acquainted, he answered, as our author tells us, “That it was no matter how the chapel stood, so the heart stood aright.” Which tale being told by him, and believed by others, (*et populum, qui sibi credit, habet*, OVIDIUS in *Epistola Hypsipyl.*) as he is like enough to find many believers, farewell to all external reverence in the service of God. What need we trouble ourselves or others with standing, kneeling, bowing in the acts of worship ? it is no matter in what posture the body be, *so the heart be right*.

FULLER.—The speech of king James was no tale, but a truth ; when he did not exclude bodily reverence, but prefer soul-sincerity in divine service. Parallel unto those scripture-instances : “For thou desirest no sacrifice,” Psalm li. 26 ; that is, thou wouldest them not, comparatively to cordial contrition. 1 Peter iv. 3, speaking of “good women, whose adorning let it not be that outward of plaiting the hair ;” namely, not chiefly therein, to the neglecting of inward holiness. Nor is the speech inductive of corporal irreverence, if believed ; seeing a man’s body may and ought easily, quickly, and cheaply be contrived into standing, bowing, kneeling ; when it requires time and expense to take down and re-build a chapel, which would cost the college five hundred pounds at the least.

11. DR. HEYLIN.—What need we put ourselves or others to the charge of surplices and hoods, of gowns and cassocks, in the officiating of God’s service ? “It is no matter in what habit the body be, *so the heart be right*.” There is another chapel in Cambridge which was never consecrated, (whether a stable or a dormitory, is all one to me,) at which when some found themselves grieved, our author tells them that others of as great learning and religion (himself especially for one) “dare defend, that the continued series of divine duties, publicly practised, for more than thirty years, (without the least check or control of those in authority,) in a place set apart to that purpose, doth sufficiently consecrate the same.” (*History of Cambridge*, page 217.) Stables and barns, by this argument, shall, in some tract of time, become as sacred as our churches.

FULLER.—Had I lived in Sidney College when that dormitory was first used for a chapel, I would have advised, and (in my sphere) advanced its consecration ; accounting the omission to fall under just reproof. But, seeing it hath been so long omitted, I

now conceive it hath no need of consecration ; seeing, though never solemnly and formally dedicated to divine service by the ordinary, (or one deputed by him,) yet hath it had a tacit and interpretative consecration, and thereby hath contracted a relative sacredness. By the same proportion it is, that utensils, long used in a family, to most civil and generous employment, by degrees acquire to themselves the reputation (in the apostle's language) of "vessels of honour;" as being opposed to such vessels employed in sordid (though necessary) service, and of the same metal and matter.

I doubt not but if this place, used for a chapel, (now about a jubilee of years,) should be turned to a stable, the Animadvertor would behold it (and justly too) as a piece of profanation ; and this intimates a sacredness therein.

It is mainly material, that bishop Andrews, of Ely,—a reverend prelate, and as knowing as any of his order in this point of antiquity,—knew this to be in his diocess, yet never manifested the least regret at the chapelizing of this place.

As for consecration of churches and chapels, I say, First : It is no sacramental action.

Secondly. It is not of evangelical institution, as Bellarmine himself doth freely confess no express for it in the New Testament.—*In statu evangelii non habemus tam expressa testimonia scripturæ.* (De Cultu Sanctorum, lib. iii. cap. 5.)

Thirdly. It is charitably to be presumed, that when Dr. Montague and the Fellows first entered the dormitory, sequestering that place for a chapel, they, by prayers and a sermon, did solemnly consign it to the service of God ; seeing no man of common principles of piety will offer to eat meat before he hath said grace.

Fourthly. Such prayers did in some sort dedicate the place, wanting no formality, save because not done by a bishop ; and if this be all the fault can be found therein, let the Animadvertor prove, (*probatio incumbit affirmanti,*) that, in the primitive times, consecrating of churches was only an episcopal act.

Fifthly. What was wanting in the consecration, at the first, hath since sufficiently been supplied and corroborated by usance thereof to God's service only.

If factious people should, in peaceable times, against lawful authority, conventicle in a barn or stable, their meetings, sinful in themselves, could not derive any sacredness to the place whilst the world lasteth.

But if persecution—which God of his goodness avert ! (though we by our wickedness deserve it)—should invade our land ; I conceive, stables are, by prayers, and presence of God's suffering

servants, and chiefly by God's presence with them, at the minute of their entrance thither, elevated into holy places.

DR. HEYLIN.—And if the brethren think it not enough for their ease to be pent up in so narrow a room, it is but repairing to the next grove or coppice; and that, in a like tract of time, shall become as holy as Solomon's temple, or any consecrated place, whatsoever it be.

FULLER.—Not the solemnest consecration can advance our churches into the same degree of sacredness with Solomon's temple; which was (yea, might be) but one dignified (when dedicated) with God's glorious presence, who "chose that place to himself for an house of sacrifice," 2 Chron. vii. 12. It was the type of our blessed Saviour, "perfect in all points," as made by inspired architects; and the utensils in the holy of holiest, the self-same which Moses made according to the pattern in the mount.

But, I hold, English churches may amount to the holiness of the Jewish synagogues.

DR. HEYLIN.—Churches may well be spared, pulled down, and their materials sold for the use of the saints.

FULLER.—God forbid! The clean contrary followeth from my position; wherein I do offer an argument for the sacredness of places, the register of whose consecration is lost, as time out of mind; so that now they can no otherwise prove it, (no record being extant thereof,) save by pious prescription: enough, in my judgment, to give sacrilege a rap over the fingers, if offering to lay hold on such places and buildings, and turn them to her private profit.

Were it in my power, I would have built a church, where I only made my Church-History. But the worst is, the Animadvertor would then have quarrelled the contriving and adorning of my church, as much as now he doth the matter and making of my book; and therefore I leave it to others, of more ability, first to do, and then to defend, their good actions from his morosity.

DR. HEYLIN.—A tub, by this our author's logic, will be as useful as the pulpit unto edification.

FULLER.—This is a *tale* (for I am sure it is no *truth*) of a *tub* indeed! I ever beheld a pulpit as in some sort *jure divino*, ever since I read, Neh. viii. 4, that "Ezra stood upon a pulpit of wood." However, if called thereunto, I pray God I may make but as good a practical sermon, as John Badby effectually preached in a tub, of constancy and Christian patience, when put into such a vessel, and burnt therein for the testimony of the truth, in the reign of king Henry IV.\*

\* Fox's "Acts and Monuments."

DR. HEYLIN.—And that we may perceive, that nothing is more precious with him than an irregular, unconsecrated, and unfurnished chapel, &c.

FULLER.—Next to an heart, such as David had, made (the best copy of the best original) “after God’s own heart,” I most highly prize a regular and consecrated chapel, furnished with matron-like, not meretricious, ornaments.

DR. HEYLIN.—Melvin’s infamous libel against the furniture of the altars in the chapels royal, (for which he was censured in the Star-Chamber,) must be brought in by head and shoulders, out of time and place, for fear lest such an excellent piece of Puritanical zeal should be lost to posterity. These things I might have noted in their proper places, but that they were reserved for this as a taste to the rest.

FULLER.—I account not those his verses worth the translating, (though easy,) and speak of his censure as well as of his offence. I mistimed nothing, having entered this passage near the year wherein he was settled a Professor beyond the seas.

12. DR. HEYLIN.—*Et jam finis erat*; “and here I thought I should have ended” this anatomy of our author’s book, but that there is another passage in the preface thereof, which requires a little further consideration.

For in that preface he informs us, by the way of caution, that “the three first books were, for the main, written in the reign of the late king, as appeareth by the passages then proper for the government. The other nine books were made since Monarchy was turned into a State.”

FULLER.—The Animadvertor hath fairly and fully (no constant practice!) cited my words; I request the reader to take especial notice of those three —“for the main.”

I presume, the reader conceiveth such a caveat not improper or impertinent, but safe and seasonable, for my defence and his direction, especially seeing the like happened not to any English historian this thousand years, that his pen (during the writing of his book) should pass through climates of different governments.\*

DR. HEYLIN.—By which it seems, that our author never meant to frame his History by the line of truth, but to attemper it to the palate of the present government, whatsoever it then was or should prove to be; which, I am sure, agrees not with the laws of History.

And though I can most easily grant, that the fourth book and the rest that follow were written after the great alteration and change of

\* The government of England, though often translated from one family (yea, nation) to another, yet hath so long continued monarchical.

state, in making a new Commonwealth out of the ruins of an ancient Monarchy ; yet I concur not with our author in the time of the former. For it appears by some passages, that the three first books either were not all written in the time of the king, or else he must give himself some disloyal hopes, that the king should never be restored to his place and power, by which he might be called to a reckoning for them.

FULLER.—“ It seems.” *Multa videntur quæ non sunt.* The inference is false and forced. Titus Livius lived in *imperial*, yet wrote of *regal*, *consulatory*, *tribunitial*, [times] at Rome, without the least imputation of falsehood. I conceive monarchical, aristocratical, and democratical truth, to be one and the same. It followeth not, that two-faced Janus (as beholding two worlds, one *before* the other *after* the flood) had also two hearts. I did not attemper my History to the palate of the government ; so as to sweeten it with any falsehood ; but I made it palatable thus far forth, as not to give a wilful disgust to those in present power, and procure danger to myself, by using any over-salt, tart, or bitter expression, better forborne than inserted, without any prejudice to the truth.

DR. HEYLIN.—For in the second book he reckons the cross in baptism for a popish trinket ; by which it appears not, I am sure, to have been written in the time of kingly government, that being no expression suitable unto such a time.

FULLER.—Should I simply and absolutely call the cross in baptism “ a popish trinket,” my forehead (signed therewith) would give my tongue the lie, and return the popery in the teeth thereof. I behold it as an ancient and significant ceremony, but in no degree essential to, or completory of, the sacrament ; witness the wisdom of the church of England, which in private baptism permitteth the omitting thereof. But when ceremonies shall devour their distance, and intrude themselves “ necessary and essential,” it is high time to term them “ superstitious trinkets.” The rest I refer to what I have written, when this passage recurrereth in the place cited by the Animadvertor.

DR. HEYLIN.—Secondly. Speaking of the precedency which was fixed in Canterbury, by removing the archi-episcopal See from London thither, he telleth us that “ the matter is not much which See went first when living ; seeing our age hath laid them both alike level in their graves.” (Book ii. vol. 1, p. 98.) But certainly the government was not changed into a State or Commonwealth till the death of the king ; and till the death of the king, neither of those episcopal Sees, nor any of the rest, were laid so “ level in their graves ” but that they were in hope of a resurrection ; the king declaring himself very constantly in the treaty at the Isle of Wight, as well against

the abolishing of the episcopal government, as the alienation of their lands.

Thirdly. In the latter end of the same book, he makes a great dispute against the high and sacred privilege of the kings of England, in curing the disease commonly called the "king's evil," whether to be imputed to magic, or imagination, or indeed a miracle; next brings us in an old-wives' tale about queen Elizabeth, as if she had disclaimed that power which she daily exercised; and, finally, manageth a quarrel against the Form of Prayer used at the curing of that evil, which he arraigns for superstition and impertinencies,—no inferior crimes. Are all these passages proper to that government also?

Finally. In the third book, he derogates from the power of the church in making canons, giving the binding and concluding power in matters which concern the civil rights of the subjects, not to the king, but to the lay-people of the land assembled in Parliament; which game he after followeth in the eighth and last. And though it might be safe enough for him, in the eighth and last, to derogate in this manner from the king's supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs; yet certainly it was neither safe for him so to do, nor proper for him so to write, in the time of the kingly government, unless he had some such wretched hopes as before we spake of.

FULLER.—I desire the reader to remember my late words, as the Animadvertor recited them,—“for the main.”

I confess, though these books were written in the reign of king Charles, yet, after his death, I interpolated some lines, and, amongst others, that of levelling all bishoprics.

I raised no dispute against the king's curing the evil, it being raised before I was born; and which I endeavoured to allay, referring it to miracle, as to the peruser of my History in that place will appear. I tell no *old-wives'* tale of queen Elizabeth, it being a *masculine* truth, from most authentic authors.

I *derogate* not, in the least degree, from the power of the church; but the Animadvertor doth *arrogate* unto it more than is due by the laws of God and man; maintaining that churchmen may go beyond ecclesiastical censures, even to the limbs and lives of such as are recusants to their constitutions.

“Wretched” and, what formerly he said, “disloyal hopes,” I defy, and return them in the teeth of him that wrote the words.

He had “wretched and disloyal hopes” who wrote, that king James went to Newmarket, as Tiberius to his Capræ; he waved his loyalty and discretion together, who so saucily and un-subject-like counted how often king Charles waved his crown.

Here give me leave to tell the Animadvertor, that such whom he slighteth for “low royalists” were, whilst they had a king in England, as high in their loyalty to him, prayers and sufferings

for him, as those high royalists who maintain that all goods of the subjects are at the king's absolute dispose; and yet, since those kings are departed this life, can write of them in so base and disparaging language, that any one of the low royalists would have his right hand cut off, rather than write the like. Reader, pardon my too just passion, when disloyalty is laid to my charge. It is with me, "Either now speak, or else for ever hereafter hold your peace."

13. DR. HEYLIN.—I must needs say, that, on the reading of these passages, and the rest that follow, I found myself possessed with much indignation.

And I long expected when some champion would appear in the lists against this Goliath, who so reproachfully had "defied the whole armies of Israel."

And I must needs confess withal, that I did never enter more unwillingly on any undertaking than I did on this.

But, being solicited thereunto by letters, messages, and several personal addresses, by men of all orders and dignities in the church, and of all degrees in the Universities, I was at last overcome by that importunity which I found would not be resisted.

FULLER.—"Indignation" is grief and anger boiled up to the height. What just cause I have given for so great passion, the reader will judge.\*

If I be a Goliath, in this point may I have his success—to be conquered, killed, and my head cut off even with my own sword! If I be none, may the Animadvertor be graciously pardoned!

And it may be, he shall never come off any undertaking more unhappily.

I could mate him, with telling him, that men of all sorts and sizes, their equals in number and quality, have likewise importuned me, not tamely to sit down, but to vindicate my own credit and conscience.

DR. HEYLIN.—I know, that, as the times now stand, I am to expect nothing for my pains and travail, but the displeasure of some, and the censure of others.

FULLER.—I will take no advantage by the times; and if, without their help, I cannot buoy up my credit, let it sink for ever. And I humbly desire all, who have, or may reap, benefit by my books, not to be displeased with the Animadvertor, in my behalf. It is punishment enough that he hath written, and too much for his stationer that he hath printed, so impertinent a book.

When Henry lord Hunsdon, on the highway, had, in passion, given a blow to sir Henry Colt, the lord had it returned him, the

\* The breaks in my answer relate respectively to those in the Doctor's Animadversions.



principal with interest; and when the lord's servants and followers began to draw their swords, "Away, away!" said he, "cannot I and my neighbour exchange a box on the ear, but you must interest yourselves in the matter?"

Let none of my friends and favourers engage their anger in this difference betwixt me and the Animadvertor. Let us alone; and, although we enter adversaries in the beginning, we shall, I hope, go out friends at the end, of the contest, after there hath been a pass or two betwixt ourselves. Thus, heats betwixt lawyers, born at the *bar* in Westminster-hall, are commonly buried at the *board* in the Inns of Court.

DR. HEYLIN.—(1.) But, coming to the work with a single heart, abstracted from all self-ends and private interests, I shall satisfy myself with having done this poor service to the church, my once-blessed mother, for whose sake only I have put myself upon this adventure.

(2.) The party whom I am to deal with is so much a stranger to me, that he is neither *beneficio nec injuriâ notus*; and therefore no particular respects have moved me to the making of these "Animadversions:"

(3.) Which I have writ, without relation to his person, "for vindication of the truth, the church, and the injured clergy," as before is said. So that I may affirm with an honest conscience:—

(4.) *Non lecta est operi, sed data, causa meo*, "that this employment was not chosen by me, but imposed upon me;" the irresistible entreaties of so many friends having something in them of commands.

(5.) But, howsoever, *Jacta est alea*, as Cæsar once said when he passed over the Rubicon:

(6.) "I must now take my fortune, whatsoever it proves." So God speed me well!

FULLER.—(1.) How much of this "self-denying ordinance" is performed by him, let the reader judge in due time.

(2.) I am glad to hear this passage from the Animadvertor, that *I never did him any injury*; the rather, because some of my friends have charged me for provoking his pen against me. And though I pleaded, that neither in thought, word, nor deed, I ever did him any wrong, I hardly prevailed with them for belief: and now the Animadvertor hath cleared me, that I *never* did any injury unto him. Would I could say the same of him, that he never did me any injury! However, as a Christian, I here fully and freely forgive him; and hereafter will endeavour, as a scholar, so to defend myself against his injury, that (God willing) it shall not shake my contentment.

(3.) "Without relation to my person," let the reader be judge hereof. Indeed THOMAS hath been well used by him, but FULLER

hath soundly felt his displeasure. However, if “truth, the church, and clergy,” have been abused by me, he hath given me too fair quarter, who deserved death downright for so heinous an offence.

(4.) Amongst all which persons inciting him to write against me, one letter sent to him from *regina pecunia* was most prevalent with him. Witness this his book offered to, and refused by, some stationers, because, on his high terms, they could not make a saving bargain to themselves.

(5.) *Jacta est alea*. The English is, “You have cast the dye.” And seeing the Animadvertor hath begun the metaphor, I hope I may make it an allegory, without rendering either of us scandalous. I appeal to the reader, whom I make groom-porter, (termed by Mr. Camden, *aleatorum arbiter*,) and let him judge who plays with false, who cogs, who slurs a dye; and, in a doubtful case, when we cannot agree upon the cast betwixt ourselves, let him decide it.

(6.) By “fortune,” I presume the Animadvertor intendeth nothing derogatory to Divine Providence; in which sense St. Augustine retracteth his former frequent using of the word. Only he meaneth “uncertainty of success,” in which notion I say an hearty Amen to his prayer, when I have enlarged his “God speed me” into “God speed us well.” May he who manageth this controversy with most sincerity, come off with best success! Amen.

ERRATA CONFESSED BY THE PRINTER OF DR. HEYLIN'S  
“ANIMADVERSIONS.”

Page	10,	line	17,	(10,)	for	<i>Melkinus</i>	...	read	Telkinus,
—	20,	—	21,	(26,)	...	<i>queen of</i> ,	.....	queen	of England.
—	27,	—	6,	(32,)	...	<i>Wooderpoir</i> ,	.....	Woodensdike.	
—	42,	—	1,	(42,)	...	<i>inconsideratenesse</i>		the inconsiderate-	ness of children.
—	121,	—	2,	(140,)	...	<i>bet</i> ,	.....	better.	
—	145,	—	2,	(161,)	...	<i>statuendo</i>	.....	statuendi.	
—	154,	—	23,	(177,)	...	<i>Contnar</i>	.....	Cantuar.	
—	159,	—	17,	(182,)	...	<i>Dr. Hammond</i>	...	Dr. Boke.	
—	160,	—	1,	(182,)	...	<i>his</i>	.....	this.	
—	163,	—	28,	(187,)	...	<i>Jesuits</i>	.....	Franciscans.	
—	189,	—	15,	(212,)	...	<i>confewon</i>	.....	confession.	
—	221,	in the marg.	(257,)	...	<i>whether</i>	.....	with	other.	
—	228,	—	2,	(268,)	...	<i>den</i>	.....	dean.	
—	239,	—	29,	(287,)	...	<i>commons</i>	.....	canons.	
—	271,	—	ult.,	(327,)	...	<i>culis</i>	.....	oculis.*	

\* This list of Heylin's *Errata*, and Fuller's remarks upon them, are offered to the reader, as illustrative of Fuller's plea of the peccant qualities of his opponent's productions, and as forming a part of his own apology. The references to the pages

FULLER.—This is a catalogue of prelal mistakes, committed and confessed in the doctor's book of Animadversions, and here by me inserted, not to disparage the pains or care of the printer, but on these considerations :—

First. To prevent all exceptions, that I have defectively presented in his book.

Secondly. To show, that sometimes (as here) there may be an *erratum erratorum*, to be re-reformed. It thus beginneth : “Page 10, line 17, for *Melkinus* read *Telkinus*.” That is, read that which is wrong, instead of that which was right before. For a *Melkinus* Avalonius appeareth in Bale, Pits, and others, but a *Telkinus* was never in nature. But take notice also of this confessed mistake, “Page 163, line 28, for Jesuits read Franciscans.” There is here no temptation to the press to err, there being, betwixt the two words, no literal similitude, or orthographical symbolizing ; scarce a letter in the one which is in the other.

I make no other use hereof, save only to crave the like favour, in my own defence, when in the earls of March, Roger is misprinted Edward ; and in the earls of Bath, Henry is misprinted William, in my “Church-History.”

I confess there be some press-faults in this my book ; as for *prelial*, (wherever occurring,) read *prelal* ; part i. page 50, line 32, (1,) for *anno Domini* 580, read 560 ; part i. page 52, line 18, (1,) for *demol*, read *deinol* ; and part ii. page 88, betwixt lines 33 and 34, (173,) insert, I pray, “Papists, nonconformists, and covetous conformists, the acts therein appearing like.”

For the rest, I hope they are nothing so many or great as to discompose the sense, and therefore I confide in the reader's discretion, as also in the Animadvertor's ingenuity, expecting he will deal as candidly with me as I have done with him, when such (though unconfessed) *errata* do occur.

And because my hand is now in, I request such as have my “Church History” to delete these words, book ii. vol. 1, p. 197 : “A title till his time unknown in England.” For, I profess, I know not by what casualty these words crept into my book, contrary to my intent.

remain as they stood in the *first* edition of the *Examen Historicum* ; but as Heylin distributed his diatribe into three hundred and thirty-seven “Animadversions,” which he distinctly numbered, generally as separate paragraphs, these numbers are retained in this reprint of his work, and are added (within parentheses) to each of these Errata. The same care has been observed in the few references here adduced by Fuller, and in other passages of his “Appeal.”—EDIT.

## BOOK I.

## OF THE CONVERSION OF THE BRITONS TO THE FAITH OF CHRIST.

1. DR. HEYLIN.—In order to the first conversion of the British nations, our author takes beginning at “the sad condition they were in, before the Christian faith was preached unto them.” And in a “sad condition” they were indeed, as being in the state of Gentilism, and, consequently, without the true knowledge of the God that made them.

FULLER.—The “author takes beginning” where Dr. Heylin himself, had he writ the “Church-History of Britain,” I believe, would, and I am sure should, have begun. And seeing he concur-eth with the author in the same expression, that the Britons were in a sad condition, he might have spared himself and his reader the trouble of the following impertinency.

DR. HEYLIN.—But yet they were not in a worse condition than the other Gentiles, &c.

FULLER.—Nor did I ever say they were. Had I said so, the doctor’s carping had had a handle to hold on, whereas now his teeth and nails must bite and scratch a fastening for themselves.

DR. HEYLIN.—But yet, not in a worse condition than the other Gentiles, who were not only darkened in their understandings, but so depraved also in their affections, as to “work all manner of uncleanness even with greediness.” Not so effeminate in their conversation as the Asiatics, nor so luxurious as the Greeks, nor branded with those filthy and unnatural lusts which St. Paul chargeth on the Romans, and were in ordinary practice with most eastern nations.

FULLER.—What of all this? It is said of king Joram: “He wrought evil in the sight of the Lord, but not like his father and like his mother,” 2 Kings iii. 2. It is said of king Hoshea, “He did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, but not as the kings of Israel that were before him,” 2 Kings xvii. 2. It doth not follow, that these kings were good, because less bad than others. So that my words stand an unshaken truth, that the Britons, before their conversion, were (though not so debauched as other Heathens) “idolaters, in a sad condition.”

DR. HEYLIN.—And though they were idolaters, yea, and foul idolaters, as our author hath it; yet, neither, &c.—

FULLER.—If they were idolaters, they must be foul ones, except (as one hath fancied a TALE of a *fair* Ethiopian) any could make a TRUTH of *fair* idolaters.

DR. HEYLIN.—Yet neither were their gods of so brutish and impure a nature as the Priapus, Cloacina, and Stercutia, amongst the Romans; or as their Venus, Flora, Lupa,—common harlots all. Of which, and such like other gods, the old Fathers tell us, that they were not *nomina colendorum, sed crimina colentium*.\* Nor were they so immodest and obscene in their rites and ceremonies as were the Greeks and Romans, in the sacrifices to their Cybele or Berecynthia, whom they call “the mother of the gods;” described by Arnobius, Lactantius, and others of the ancient writers, in such lively colours as no chaste eye can look upon them without detestation.

FULLER.—Well may the doctor run apace, drawing an empty cart after him. What is all this to confute my position, that “the unconverted Britons, foul idolaters, were in a sad condition?” It seems, he had a mind to tell the world of the foulest idols amongst the Romans; and if so, let *them* thank him for his intelligence *who* knew it not before.

DR. HEYLIN.—And for the number of their gods, they fell extremely short of that infinite multitude which St. Augustine finds amongst the Romans; our author naming only three, (which he calls “gods paramount,”) that is to say, Belinus, Andate, and Diana.

FULLER.—If they had only three gods, they had two too many. However, it will appear, that these were only (as the author phraseth them) “paramount.”

That they fell not (to use the doctor’s words) “extremely short” (a virtuous extreme) of the Romans in their idolatry, may thus be proved:—

They that had idols almost exceeding the Egyptians in number, fell not much short of the Romans:

But the ancient Britons almost exceeded the Egyptians in number of idols:

Therefore they fell not much short of the Romans.

The major is plain in Scripture, often complaining of the idols of Egypt; as also in human writers, Juvenal jeering the Egyptians for being over-stocked with such kind of cattle, whose gods (leeks and onions) did commonly grow in their gardens.

The minor are the very words of grave Gildas, the most ancient British writer, flourishing *anno Domini* 560: *Portenta pænè numero Ægyptiaca vincentia*. Where, in few words, we have the numerosity and monstrosity of the British idols. *Numerosity*, “almost exceeding the Egyptians;” *monstrosity*, called *portents*, mis-shapen antics of prodigious deformity.

\* “These were not the names of such persons or objects as were worthy of adoration, but they were rather the personifications of the very crimes in which the worshippers themselves delighted to indulge.” This is one of those sage remarks, the whole force of which is not perceived at the first glance.—EDIT.

DR. HEYLIN.—When therefore Gildas tells us of the ancient Britons, that in the number of their gods they had almost exceeded Egypt, (*portenta pænè numero Ægyptiaca vincentia*, in that author's language,) he must be understood with reference to the times in which he lived, when all the Roman rabble had been thrust upon them; and not as speaking of the times of their first conversion.

FULLER.—*Satis pro imperio*, “MUST is for a king;” and seeing the doctor and I are both kings alike, I return, “He *must* not be so understood;” as to any judicious and indifferent reader will appear.

For the clearing hereof, I will present and translate the words of Gildas, with what precedeth and followeth them, conducing effectually to the true understanding of this clause controverted. I use the first and best printed edition, set forth by Polydore Virgil, 1525, and dedicated to Cuthbert Tunstal, then the learned bishop of London. Only, because I suspect that some readers will be out of breath in going along with the long-winded style of Gildas, (the excusable fault of the age he lived in,) I crave leave to divide his long and entire sentence, for the better understanding thereof, into several parcels, without the least addition thereto, or alteration thereof.

GILDAS, folio primo.

*Igitur omittens priscos illos, communesque cum omnibus gentibus, errores, quibus ante adventum Christi in carne omne humanum genus obligabatur adstrictum.*

*Nec enumerans patriæ portenta ipsa diabolica pænè numero Ægyptiaca vincentia, quorum nonnulla lineamentis adhuc deformibus intra vel extra deserta mœnia solito more rigentia, torvis vultibus intuemur.*

*Neque nominatim inclamitans montes ipsos, aut colles, vel fluvios, (olim exitiabiles, nunc verò humanis usibus utiles,) quibus divinus honor a cæco tunc populo cumulabatur.*

*Et tacens vetustos immanium*

GILDAS, first leaf.

Omitting, therefore, those old errors, and common (to the Britons) with other nations, to which all mankind was tied and fettered before the coming of Christ in the flesh.

Nor reckoning up those very devilish portents of our own country, almost exceeding those of Egypt in number; some whereof we, with frowning eyes, do still behold, drawn with deformed shapes within or without our desert walls.

Nor calling upon by name the mountains themselves, or hills, or rivers, (in times past deadly, now profitable to man's use,) on which divine honour was then heaped up by the blind people.

And passing over in silence

*tyrannorum annos, qui in aliis longè positis regionibus vulgati sunt; ita ut Porphyrius, rabidus orientalis adversus ecclesiam canis, dementiæ suæ ac vanitatis stylo hoc etiam adnecteret, Britannia, inquit, fertilis provincia tyrannorum.*

*Ille tantum proferre conabor in medium, quæ temporibus Romanorum imperatorum et passa est, et aliis intulit civibus et longè positis, mala.*

the ancient years of those vast tyrants, which are commonly spoken of in other far-distant countries; so that Porphyrius, (that raging dog of the east against the church,) in the style of his madness and vanity, addeth this also: "Britain," saith he, "a fruitful province of tyrants."

I will only endeavour publicly to proffer such evils, as she (Britain) in the times of the Roman emperors both suffered in herself, and impressed on other people placed far off.

See here this prolix sentence of Gildas, built (as I may say) five stories high: the four first are of privation or preterition,—of what he will not meddle with; the fifth and last, of position,—whereon he would insist. He would not reckon the British errors common with others, nor *patriæ portenta*, "the portentive idols of their country," which plainly decideth the thing in controversy,—that those their idols were *indigenæ, non advenæ*, "natives, not foreigners," of British origination, not Roman superinduction. His method plainly proveth, that these subjects which he declineth to treat of, were all of them precedaneous to the Romans coming into Britain, whence he beginneth his History. I mention not the marginal note of Polydore Virgil, (placed over against the words of Gildas,) *Veterum Britannorum vana religio*, "The vain religion of the old Britons." The rest of his testimony we leave lying in the deck, and it will not be long before we shall make use thereof.

DR. HEYLIN.—But whether their idols were more or fewer, our author is resolved on Diana for one: though whether this were a British deity, may be more than questioned, whose temple was built in or near the place where St. Paul's now stands, as our learned antiquaries do acknowledge.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor doth confess, that the Britons did worship Diana. But whether she was one of the latter brood of idols, brought in by the Romans at their conquest, or hatched long before amongst the Britons as their own country-goddess, is the question. I am confident in the latter.



The British stories tell us, that Brutus, (some hundred of years before the Romans arrived here,) being upon his sea-voyage to seek his fortune, repaired to the temple of Diana, in an island called Largeria; and, there addressing himself to her temple, was, in a dream, not only instructed in the manner of her sacrifices and ritual services, but also directed to an island in the west, now Britain, where his posterity should fix themselves in happiness. And that this passeth for current amongst the Welsh, I report myself to their learned gentry, the proper judges thereof.

Let me add this passage from the pen of as great an antiquary, as any Wales now doth enjoy:—

“As for the name of Diana, I do conceive that she was called Dain in our language; and I have many histories of our nation, that seem to make no question of it. To this day in Wales, fat marketable cattle are called *guarthege deinol*; that is to say, ‘Diana’s cattle,’ or, ‘cattle fit to be sacrificed,’ &c. And I am more than confident, there is no man living can put any other interpretation upon this word *deinol*; it must be an adjective of *dain*, and *dain* hath no other signification in our language, than the name of Diana.”

2. DR. HEYLIN.—(This temple of Diana in London,) saith he, “rendereth their conceit not altogether unlikely, who will have London so called from *Llan-Dian*, which signifieth, in British, ‘the temple of Diana.’”—A conceit, whosoever it was, not altogether so likely neither as the author makes it.

FULLER.—No cautiousness of proof against captiousness. I called it but a “conceit;” I said not that it was true; yea, my words left an insinuation of unlikeliness to an indifferent reader. But, seeing the Animadvertor is so hard-hearted to an innocent conceit, I shall hereafter love it the better.

DR. HEYLIN.—A conceit, (London from *Llan-Dian*,) whosoever it was, not altogether so likely neither as the author makes it. For though the Britons, being well stored with woods and venison, possibly might have a hunting goddess amongst the rest; yet, certainly, she was not called by the name of Diana, till the Roman conquest and plantations, before which time this city had the name of London, (or Londinium,) as we read in Tacitus. The name and sacrifices of Diana were not originally British, but of Roman race, as the great temple in or near the place where St. Paul’s now stands was of their foundation. The Britons, worshipping Apollo by the name of Belinus, as both Camden\* and our author say they did, must be supposed to have another name for Diana also, and were more likely to have called her by the name of Artemis, her old Grecian name, or by some other

\* CAMDEN, in Middlesex.

of as near a resemblance to it, as Belinus was to that of Bel in the eastern countries. Assuredly, if that great city had received its name from Diana's temple, the Welsh, being so tenacious of their ancient language, would have had some remembrance of it; who to this day call it *Lundayn*, and not *Llan-Dian*, according to the new conceit which our author speaks of. But of this enough.

FULLER.—Yea, indeed, too much! So may you say, “A surfeit is enough.” “Whosoever this conceit was:”—I had thought the Animadvertor could not have been ignorant thereof, being no meaner a man than Mr. Selden.

This learned antiquary, after he had alleged some verses out of Robert of Gloucester, deriving the name of London, quasi *Lud's town*, from *Lud*, he proceedeth as followeth, in his notes on the eighth song in Polyolbion, page 126:—“Judicious reformers of fabulous report, I know, have more serious derivations of the name; and, seeing conjecture is free, I could imagine it might be called at first *Lhan-Dien*, that is, ‘the temple of Diana,’ as *Lhan-Dewi*, *Lhan-Stephan*, *Lhan-Padern Vaur*, *Lhan-Vair*, that is, St. Dewy's, St. Stephen's, St. Patern the great, St. Mary's, (and Verulam is, by H. Lhuid, derived from *Ver-Lhan*, that is, ‘the church upon the river Ver,’) with divers more such places in Wales: and so afterwards by strangers turned into *Londinium*, and the like; for that Diana and her brother Apollo (under the name of Belin) were two great deities amongst the Britons.”

If the Animadvertor hath a mind to enter the list with Mr. Selden, and have a venue with him to try whose skill is most and weapon best, he may, if he pleaseth.

3. DR. HEYLIN.—Now to facilitate this great work of their conversion, Camden and Godwin, two great antiquaries, have alleged one reason, which is not allowed of by our author; and our author hath alleged another reason, which none can allow of but himself. The reason alleged by the two great antiquaries, is, that “the Druids did instruct the Britons in the knowledge of one only God,” which, questionless, was a great step toward their conversion. *Druides unum esse Deum semper inculcârunt*, saith our author's margin. But this he reckoneth a mistake, and thus charitably wisheth thereupon; namely, “May their mistake herein be as freely forgiven them, as I hope and desire that the charitable reader will, with his pardon, meet those involuntary errors which in this work by me shall be committed.” (“Church-History,” vol. i. p. 6.) Whether all the errors of our author be involuntary, or not, (for I grant that some of them may be such,) will be seen hereafter.

FULLER.—In good time, Sir. But till this “hereafter” cometh, “judge not, lest you be judged;” and think charitably, that a Christian will not willingly, wittingly, and wilfully run into errors.

DR. HEYLIN.—But whether those two learned pens were mistaken or not, shall be now examined. I conceive clearly, that they were not mistaken in it, it being, First, improbable, if not impossible, that two men of such parts and learning, and of such eminent integrity in all their writings, should vent a proposition, or position rather, which they have no ground for.

FULLER.—They were learned pens indeed, as ever our nation bred, in their kind of studies; and great antiquaries. But only “the Ancient of Days” is omniscient and infallible. (Dan. vii. 9.) And I am confident, such was their ingenuity, that they would rather be thankful to, than angry, with any who, with due respect to their persons, should discover their mistakes; amongst which, this was one,—“that the Druids instructed the Britons in the knowledge of one God.”

The contrary doth plainly appear by the testimony of Gildas, lately alleged; whose words are so walled about (as I may say) on both sides, by what went before and after that, as they cannot be evaded, they cannot be perverted to other reference, than relating unto the religion of the ancient Britons, long before the entrance of the Romans into this island; who, besides a numerous rabblement of portentous idols, gave divine honour to mountains, hills, and rivers. Nothing can be more diametrically opposite to the worship of one God, than such gross and generally-diffused polytheism.

Add to the authority of Gildas that of Origen, thus writing in his fourth homily on Ezekiel:—*Confitentur et miserabiles Judæi hæc de Christi præsentia prædicari; sed stultè ignorant personam, cum videant impleta quæ dicta sunt. Quando enim terra Britannia ante adventum Christi in unius Dei consensit religionem? Quando terra Maurorum, &c.*

All judicious readers easily understand this interrogation, “When did the land of Britain, before the coming of Christ, consent in the religion of one God?” I say, all do understand, that this his question, asked and left unanswered, amounteth unto a very strong negation; and that, before the coming of Christ, Britain was divided into the worshipping of many gods.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, Secondly, our author tells of the Druids, that they were philosophers, divines, and lawyers, to the rest of the Britons; and if philosophers, they might, by their long study in the book of nature, and their industrious inquiry into natural causes, attain unto the knowledge of that One and only Supernatural Cause, (as others of the heathen philosophers in their several countries,) from which the works of nature had their first original. And of some other the old philosophers it is said expressly by Minutius,\* that they had

\* In Octavio.

spoken so divinely of the things of God *ut quivis arbitretur aut nunc Christianos philosophos esse, aut philosophos fuisse jam tunc Christianos*. So little was the difference in that particular, between those old philosophers and the primitive Christians! For though they did admit a multitude of inferior gods, topical in respect of countries, and tutelar in respect of particular persons; yet, in the middle of that darkness, they discerned one supreme God over all the rest; Πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, as the Grecians—*Hominum sator atque Deorum*, as the Latins—call him.\* And though they were mistaken in the name of that Supreme Power, whom generally they entituled by the name of Jupiter, yet they did well enough agree in giving him the supreme power over all the world. *Et qui Jovem principem volunt falluntur in nomine, sed de eâ potestate consentiunt*, as my author hath it.† Nor did those old philosophers keep the great truth unto themselves, like a candle in a dark lanthorn, or “hid under a bushel;” but placed it like a great light on the top of a mountain, that all the people might discern it; who thereupon, lifting their hands unto the heavens, did frequently make their addresses but to one God only, saying in common speech unto one another, that God was great, and God was true, and, “If God permit.” Of which, my author (the same Christian advocate) seems to make a question: *Vulgi iste naturalis sermo est, an Christiani confitentis oratio?*‡ that is to say, “Whether those expressions savoured not rather of the Christian, than the vulgar heathen?” And hereupon I may conclude in the behalf of the Druids, (or rather of those learned pens who affirm it of them,) that, being philosophers in study, and divines by office, and very eminent in their times in both capacities, they might as well instruct the people in the knowledge of one only God, as any other of the heathen sages, either Greeks or Romans. The reason alleged by these great antiquaries being thus made good, we next proceed to the examination of that which is produced by our author.

FULLER.—In this long harangue, I know not what the Animadvertor aims at: this I know, he hits not me, nor allegeth any thing in opposition to what I have written. If he desireth only to prove, that the refined heathens worshipped one god above all the rest, he shall not only have my free consent, but the adjection of this my symbol thereunto.

I conceive, that the Pagans adored the essence of God under the name of Jupiter: and his attributes under other titles,—wisdom, of Apollo; omnipresence, swiftness, of Mercury; power, of Mars; beauty, of Venus; providence over the sea, Neptune; winds, Æolus; cattle, Pan, &c. Yet can I not see, how this can excuse them from being foul idolaters, seeing the moral commandment doth not say, “Thou shalt not have other gods in equal degree of worship with me;” but, “Thou shalt not have other gods before

\* VIRGILII *Æneid.* lib. i.

† MINUTIUS FELIX in *Octavio*.

‡ *Idem, ibid.*

me," Exod. xx. 3; and the Animadvertor knoweth well, that the original importeth, *coram me*, that is, "Thou shalt have none other in my sight or presence."

Now, for quietness' sake, let the result of this long discourse (so far as I can understand) be granted him, and it amounts to no more than to put the Britons in the same form with the Grecians; instructed by their Druids in the worship of one God, as well and as far as the Grecians were in the same lesson by their philosophers. Now, what the Grecians held and did in this point will appear by the practice of the Athenians, whose city was the mistress of Greece, staple of learning, and palace of philosophers; and how well the Athenians worshipped one God, we have from the infallible witness of St. Paul, "whose spirit was stirred within him, whilst he saw the city wholly given to idolatry," Acts xvii. 16. Whence it will follow, that the Britons, form-fellows with the Grecians, were wholly given to idolatry: Which is as much as, and more than, I said before.

And now the reader may judge what progress the Animadvertor hath made in confuting what I have written; yea, less than the beast *Pigritia* in Brazil, which, as he telleth us elsewhere, \* goeth not so far in fourteen days as one may throw a stone. Yea, our adversary hath not gone at all, (save backward,) and if he doth not mend his pace, it will be late before he cometh to his lodging.

Here let me mind the Animadvertor, that my Church-History thus beginneth: "That we may the more freely and fully pay the tribute of our thanks to God's goodness for the gospel which we now enjoy, let us recount the sad condition of the Britons, our predecessors, before the Christian faith was preached unto them." If therefore the Animadvertor by his tedious discourse, endeavouring to un-idolatrize the Britons as much as he could; I say, if hereby he hath hindered or lessened any man's paying of his thanks to God, he hath done a thankless office both to God and man therein. Our author proceedeth,—

4. DR. HEYLIN.—Our author, who telleth us, that "it facilitated the entrance of the gospel hither, that lately the Roman conquest had in part civilized the south of this island, by transporting colonies, and erecting of cities there." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 7.) Than which, there could not any thing be said more different from the truth of story, or from the time of that conversion which we have in hand; performed (as all our later writers—and amongst them our author himself—have affirmed from Gildas, who lived in the fourth century of the Christian church) *tempore summo Tiberii Cæsaris*, "toward the latter end of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar;" that is to say, about

\* In his "Microcosm," p. 800.

thirty-seven years after Christ's nativity; at what time the Romans had neither erected any one city, nor planted any one colony, in the south parts of the island. For though Julius Cæsar, in pursuance of his Gallic conquest, had attempted this island, crossed the Thames, and pierced as far as Verulamium, in the country of the Cattieuchlani; (now Hertfordshire;) yet, either finding how difficult a work it was like to prove, or having business of more moment, he gave over the enterprise, resting contented with the honour of the first discovery; *et ostendisse potiùs quàm tradidisse*, as we read in Tacitus. Nothing done after this in order to the conquest of Britain, until the time of Claudius. Augustus would by no means be persuaded to the undertaking; and much less Tiberius, in whose last years the gospel was first preached in Britain, as before was said, *Consilium id divus Augustus vocabat, Tiberius præcipuè*.\* And though Caligula was once resolved on the expedition, yet, being never constant to his resolutions, he soon gave it over; leaving the honour of this conquest to his uncle Claudius, who next succeeded in the empire; and being invited into Britain by a discontented party amongst the natives, reduced some part thereof into the form of a Roman province. Of this, see Tacitus at large, in "the Life of Agricola." By which it will appear most clearly, that there was neither city of the Roman erection, nor colony of their plantation, till the time of Claudius; and consequently no such facilitating of the work, by either of those means which our author dreams of. But, from *the time*, proceed we to *the authors*, of this first conversion; of which thus our author—

FULLER.—In the First place, know, reader, that Mr. Burton, in his late learned notes on Antoninus, justifieth, that Julius Cæsar did colonize (whatever the Animadvertor saith to the contrary) some part of this land; otherwise, his whole conquest would have unravelled after his departure, and his successors had had their work to begin afresh.

Secondly. I say not, "the *first* entrance," but, "the entrance of the Gospel" was facilitated by the Roman conquest. The entrance of the Gospel into this island was so far from being done in an instant, or, *simul et semel*, that it was not, *res unius seculi*, "the product of one age;" but was successively done, *πολυμερῶς και πολυτρόπως*, "at sundry times, and in divers manners." So that this extensive entrance of the Christian religion, gradually insinuating itself, took up a century of years, from the latter end of Tiberius, and so forwards.

Christianity entered not into this island like lightning, but like light. None can behold this essay thereof in the time of Tiberius, otherwise than a morning-star; some forty years after, the day dawned; and lastly, under king Lucius, (that *leuer-maure*, or "the great light,") the sun of religion may be said to arise; before which

\* TACITUS in *Vita Agricola*.

time, the south of this island was sufficiently colonized by the Romans, whereby commerce and civility ushered Christianity into Britain. Yet, to clear my words, not from untruth in themselves, but mistakes in others, and to avoid all appearance of falsehood, it shall be altered (God willing) in the next edition: "It facilitated the entrance and propagation of the gospel here," &c.

5. DR. HEYLIN.—"Parsons the Jesuit mainly stickleth for the apostle Peter to have first preached the gospel here." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 8.) And our author doth as mainly stickle against it. The reason which induced Parsons so to stickle in it, was, as our author thinks and telleth us, page 9, "to infer an obligation of this island to the See of Rome." And to exempt this island from the obligation, our author hath endeavoured to disprove the tradition.

FULLER.—That the Jesuit furiously driveth on that design, appeareth to any that peruse his works; and your author conceiveth his own endeavours lawful and useful in stopping his full career, and disobliging the Church of England from a debt as unjustly pretended, as vehemently prosecuted.

*Et veniam pro laude petit; laudatus abunde,  
Non fastiditus, si tuus author erit.*

"Your author for his praise doth pardon crave;  
If not despised, his praise enough shall have."

It is therefore but hard measure, for you to requite his good intentions (if failing in success) with contempt and reproach.

DR. HEYLIN.—Whereas, indeed, St. Peter's preaching in this island, (if he were the first that preached here,) in the time of Tiberius, must be before his preaching in the city of Rome, to which he came not till the reign of the emperor Claudius. And thereupon it followeth, by the Jesuit's logic, that the Britons, by sparing their apostle to preach at Rome, did lay an obligation upon that city, but received none from it.

FULLER.—Yea, but if Simeon Metaphrastes \* be to be believed, (on whose testimony Parsons principally relieth,) being the self-same author whom the Animadvertor within few lines hereafter doth so highly commend and extol, St. Peter preached here, not before, but long after, his being at Rome; and but a little before his death; namely, in the twelfth year of Nero Cæsar.

DR. HEYLIN.—Or, granting that St. Peter had first preached at Rome, yet would this draw upon us no such engagement to the pope and the church of Rome, as our author fears; and other German nations, by Boniface, Willibald, Willibad, Willibrod, and Swibert, (English Saxons all,) might or did draw the like dependence of those churches upon this of England.

\* S. METAPHRASTES, *Comment. de Petro et Paulo ad diem 29 Junii.*



FULLER.—The proportion, I confess, is good and well-grounded: but I answer, Great the difference betwixt the natures of England and Rome. England never pretended superiority over other churches; which Rome doth, prosecuting even shadowy pretences with all violence. What the talent-hiding servant said of his master, may be justly said of modern Rome: “She reapeth where she hath not strawed;” demanding *officium*, where she never bestowed *beneficium*, and requiring duty where she never conferred courtesy. Rome, therefore, being no fair creditor, but so cruel an extortioner, I conceive my pains well employed to quit England from a debt of obligation, unjustly exacted of her by Parsons the Jesuit, on the pretence of St. Peter’s preaching here.

DR. HEYLIN.—So that, this fear being overblown, we will consider somewhat further of St. Peter’s first preaching in this island, not as delivered by tradition from the church of Rome, which is suspected to have pleaded their own interests in it; but as affirmed positively by the Greek Menologies, and in the works of Simeon Metaphrastes, an approved Greek author. Of the Menologies (though vouched by Camden to this purpose) our author takes no notice at all, but lets the weight of his displeasure fall on Metaphrastes.

FULLER.—The best way to over-blow this fear is, to confute the five arguments, alleged by Parsons, for St. Peter’s preaching here; which, I hope, is done effectually by me in my “Church-History,” where I follow the Jesuit verbatim, in answering to his reasons. And this is the reason that I took no notice of the Greek Menologies, because not mentioned by Parsons: whence I collect that either he had never seen them, (which is very improbable,) or else he conceived that no great belief was to be given unto them, or advantage thereby to be gotten for his cause.

6. DR. HEYLIN.—Of whom he telleth us, “Metaphrastes is an author of no credit, as Baronius himself doth confess.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 9.) But, First, Baronius himself makes no such confession; that which our author tells us from him being only this, *in aliis multis ibi ab ipso positis, errare eum certum est*; that is to say, “that he hath erred in many things by him delivered.” Assuredly if to “err in many things” delivered in so great a work as that of Simeon Metaphrastes, may forthwith be conceived sufficient to make an author of no credit, God bless not only our Historian, but Baronius himself, from being held authors of no credit; in both whom there are many errors not possible to be reconciled to the truth of story.

FULLER.—Three is a perfect number, let therefore the Animadvector be put in also; partly, to make up a complete company; partly, that he may have the benefit of his own jeer-prayers to himself.

Baronius being dead, to pray for him, is popery ; and to “ take God’s name in vain,” (to jeer us both,) is profaneness. The Animadvertor who now inserts, “ God bless,” when it might have been omitted, will omit it when it should be inserted ; as, God willing, I shall take notice of in due time and place hereafter.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, Secondly, as Baronius did not, so he could not, say, that Metaphrastes was an author of no credit : the man being not only pious, but learned also, for the times wherein he lived ; honoured as a saint in the Greek Menologies, on the 27th of November ; and graced with a Funeral Oration by Michael Psellus, a renowned scholar ; highly extolled by Balsamon for his pains and industry in this present work, and no less magnified by the Fathers in the Council of Florence, *anno* 1436. All which had never set such an estimate upon him in their several times, had he been “ an author of no credit,” as our author makes him.

FULLER.—I shall hereafter have an higher esteem for Metaphrastes. However, to return to the words of Baronius, which (in the last note) gave the occasion of this contest :—*In aliis multis IBI ab ipso positis, errare eum certum est* : “ It is certain that he hath erred in many things THERE delivered by him : ” the Animadvertor in his translation omitteth “ there,” the most emphatical word in the whole sentence ; seeing, granting Metaphrastes a good author in other things, he is erroneous *in this particular*.

7. DR. HEYLIN.—I had now ended with St. Peter, but that I find him appear in a vision to king Edward the Confessor, and telling him, that he had preached the gospel in Britain, occasioning thereby the foundation of the abbey of St. Peter in Westminster. To which our author makes this answer : “ To this vision pretended of Peter, we oppose the certain words of St. Paul : ‘ Neither give heed to fables,’ 1 Tim. iv. 1.”

What a pity is it that this apparition was not made, and the same tale told over again, to Thomas Fuller of Hammersmith, that so it might have found some credit with our author, though with nobody else.

FULLER.—Nay, rather, what a pity was it that this apparition of St. Peter was not made unto his name-sake Peter, (here the Animadvertor,) and then all had been authentic indeed.

DR. HEYLIN.—For of this Thomas Fuller our author telleth us, (and telleth it in confirmation of some miracles done by king Henry VI. after his decease,) that, being a very honest man, he had happened into the company of some who had stolen some cattle, for which he was condemned and executed ; and, being on the top of the ladder, king Harry VI. appeared unto him, and so ordered the matter that

he was not strangled with the rope, but preserved alive ; and, finally, that, in gratitude of so great a benefit, he repaired to that king's tomb in Chertsey-abbey, and there presented his humble thanks unto him for that great deliverance. There being as good authors for that apparition of St. Peter, as for this of St. Henry, *vel neutrum flammis ure, vel ure duos* ; "either let both be burned for false, or believed for truths."

FULLER.—Let the echo both in Latin and English answer for me, *Ure duos*, "Burn both," for a brace of notorious falsehoods ; and see who will shed a tear to quench the fire. As for the apparition to Thomas Fuller of Hammersmith, seeing afterwards the Animadvertor twitteth me therewith, we will, till then, defer our answer thereunto.

8. DR. HEYLIN.—Less opposition meets the preaching of St. Joseph of Arimathea, though it meeteth some. For, notwithstanding that this tradition be as general, as universally received, as almost any other in the Christian church ; yet our author, being resolved to let fly at all, declares it for a piece of "novel superstition, disguised with pretended antiquity : " better provided, as it seems, to dispute this point than the ambassadors of Castile, when they contended for precedency with those of England in the Council of Basil ; who had not any thing to object against this tradition of Joseph's preaching to the Britons, although the English had provoked them, by confuting their absurd pretences for St. James's preaching to the Spaniards.

FULLER.—I never denied the historical ground-work, but the fabulous varnish, of Arimathean Joseph here preaching. My words run thus :—"Yet because the Norman charters of Glastonbury refer to a succession of many ancient charters, bestowed on that church by several Saxon kings, as the Saxon charters relate to British grants in intuition to Joseph's being there ; we dare not wholly deny the substance of the story, though the leaven of Monckery hath much swollen and puffed up the circumstance thereof." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 14.)

And to the impartial peruser of the connexion of my words, "novel superstition, disguised with pretended antiquity," relate not to the substance of the story, but as it is presented unto us with fictitious embellishments.

And here I foretell the reader, what he shall see within few pages performed : namely, that after the Animadvertor hath flung, and flounced, and fluttered about, to show his own activity and opposition against what I (though never so well and warily) have written, at last he will calmly come up, and in this controversy close with my *sense*, though not *words*, using (for the more credit) his own expressions.

9. DR. HEYLIN.—For, First, our author does object, in the way of scorn, that the “relation is as ill accoutred with tacklings, as the ship in which it is affirmed that St. Philip, St. Joseph, and the rest, were put by the Jews, into a vessel without sails or oars, with intent to drown them ; and, being tossed with tempests, in the Mid-land Sea, at last safely landed at Marseilles in France,” and thence afterwards made for England. (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 13.) No such strange piece of errantry, (if we mark it well,) as to render the whole truth suspected.

FULLER.—Not by way of scorn, Sir, but by way of dislike and distrust. The more I mark it, the more strange piece of errantry it seemeth ; so that I cannot meet with a stranger.

DR. HEYLIN.—For, First, we find it in the monuments of elder times, that Acrisius, king of Argos, exposed his daughter Danaë, with her young son Perseus, in such a vessel as this was, and as ill-provided of all necessaries, to the open seas ; who, notwithstanding, by the Divine Providence, were safely wafted to those parts of Italy which we now call Puglia.

FULLER.—“Monuments of elder times !” What be your acts, if these be your monuments ? “Ask my fellow if I be a thief ;” ask a poetical fable, if a monkish legend be a liar. And what, if Danaë (the self-same, forsooth, which had a golden shower rained into her lap) crossed from Argos in Peloponnesus, to Apulia, now Puglia, almost in a straight line, and the narrowest part of the Adriatic ? This doth not parallel the improbability of Joseph’s voyage, in an unaccoutred ship, from some port in Palestine, to Marseilles, the way being ten times as far, full of flexures, and making of several points ; which costs our seamen some months in sailing, though better accommodated. I confess, God’s power can bring any a greater distance, with cordage of cobweb, in a nutshell ; but no wise man will make his belief so cheap, to credit such a miracle, except it be better attested.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, Secondly, for the middle times, we have *the like* story in an author above all exception ; even our author himself, who telleth us, in vol. ii. page 144, of our present History, that “king Athelstan put his brother Edwin into a little wherry or cock-boat, without any tackling or furniture thereunto, to the end,” that if the poor prince perished, “his wickedness might be imputed to the waves.”

FULLER.—Thanks for the jeer premiscd. I am not the author, but bare relater, of that story, obvious in all our English Chronicles. Nor is the story “like” to that of Joseph’s, except he had been drowned in his waftage to Marseilles, as this exposed prince Edwin was in our narrow seas, (whether wilfully or casually, not so certain,) his corpse being taken up in Flanders. The resemblance

betwixt stories chiefly consists in similitude of success; and what likeness betwixt a miserable death, and a miraculous deliverance?

10. DR. HEYLIN.—Our author objecteth in the next place, “that no writer of credit can be produced before the Conquest, who mentioneth Joseph’s coming hither.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 13.) For answer whereunto, it may, First, be said, that where there is a constant uncontrolled tradition, there is most commonly the less care taken to commit it to writing.

FULLER.—“Less care” implieth some care; whereas here no care, but a panic silence of all authors, British, Saxon, and Christian, for a thousand years together. Secondly. The Animadvertor might have done well to have instanced in any one tradition, (seeing he saith it is most commonly done,) which is constant and uncontrolled, yet attested by no creditable author, and then let him carry the cause.

DR. HEYLIN.—Secondly. That the charters of Glastonbury, relating from the Norman to the Saxon kings, and from the Saxons to the Britons, being all built upon St. Joseph’s coming hither, and preaching here, may serve instead of many authors bearing witness to it.

And, Thirdly, that Friar Bale, as great an enemy to the unwarrantable traditions of the church of Rome, as our author can desire to have him, hath vouched two witnesses hereunto, that is to say, Melkinus Avalonius,\* and Gildas Albinus; whose writings, or some fragments of them, he may be believed to have seen, though our author hath not.

FULLER.—Nor the Animadvertor, neither. Bale doth not intimate that he ever saw any part of them; and he useth to cackle when lighting on such eggs. But we collect from him and other authors, that no credit is to be given to such supposititious fragments.

11. DR. HEYLIN.—As for some circumstances in the story, that is to say, the dedicating of Joseph’s first church to the virgin Mary, the burying of his body in it, and the enclosing of the same with a large church-yard; I look upon them as the products of monkish ignorance, accommodated unto the fashion of those times which the writers lived in. There is scarce any saint in all the Calendar, whose history would not be subject to the like misconstructions, if the additaments of the middle and darker times should be produced to the disparagement of the whole narration.

FULLER.—Now the reader sees my prediction performed; namely, that after the Animadvertor had flounced about, he would close with my sense in his own words. Is not this the very same,

\* See Fuller’s remarks on this word in a preceding page. (351.)—EDIT.

in effect, with what I said, approving the substance, but rejecting the fabulous circumstances, of the story of Joseph? In all this, he hath done just nothing, save only swelled his book, (though hollow within,) to make it amount to a saleable bigness.

12. DR. HEYLIN.—But such an enemy our author is to all old traditions, that he must needs have a blow at Glastonbury thorn, though before cut down by some soldiers, as himself confesseth; like Sir John Falstaff in the play, who, to show his valour, must thrust his sword into the bodies of those men which were dead before.

FULLER.—Not to “all old traditions,” good Animadvertor. St. Paul saith, “Hold the traditions which you have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle,” 2 Thess. ii. 15. Such traditions as these, whether in doctrine or practice, I desire to retain. As for unwitnessed traditions, my enmity is not such but in the heat thereof I can smile at them. The Animadvertor hath wronged me, and the comedian hath wronged Sir John Falstaff. He was a valiant knight, famous for his achievements in France, made, as the History of St. George testifieth, (page 329,) Knight of the Garter by Henry VI. and one who disdained to violate the concernments of the dead. Nor have I been injurious to the thorn of Glastonbury, living or dead, as will appear.

DR. HEYLIN.—The budding or blossoming of this thorn, he accounts untrue, (“This, *were it true*,” &c.,) affirming, from I know not whom, “That it doth not punctually and critically bud on Christmas-day, but on the days near it and about it.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 16.) And were it no otherwise than so, the miracle were not much the less than if it budded critically on Christmas-day; as I have heard, from persons of great worth and credit dwelling near the place, that indeed it did; though unto such as had a mind to decry the festival, it was no very hard matter to belie the miracle.

FULLER.—My words amount not to an absolute denial, but to some dissatisfaction. Parcel-diffidelity in matters of such nature, I am sure, is no sin. Mr. Taylor, burgess for Bristol in the Long Parliament, was he who told me, that, going thither purposely with his kinsman, it did not that year exactly bud on Christmas-day: a person as improbable to decry the festival, being a colonel on the king's side, who refusing quarter was killed under the walls of Bristol; so unlikely, if living, to have taken *the lie* from the pen of the Animadvertor.

And now, reader, (seeing some mirth will not be amiss,) know, that as I do not believe his report, who, on a Christmas-day, stroking his hand-down his doublet before, found there a great green quick-set suddenly grown, and wondered thereat, until he

remembered that the moulds of his bald-worn buttons were made of Glastonbury-thorn; so am I not of so sullen and morose a nature, as not to credit what is generally and credibly reported. Nor do my words positively and peremptorily conclude against the budding of this thorn, but against the necessary relating thereof to Arimathean Joseph; which I rather leave at large to some occult quality in nature, paralleling it with the like, (never as yet fathered on any saint the causer thereof,) the oak in Hampshire. But enough, lest we occasion the altering of the proverb from *de lanâ caprinâ*, into *de corno Glastoniensi*.

13. DR. HEYLIN.—In fine, our author either is unwilling to have the gospel as soon preached here as in other places, or else we must have preachers for it from he knows not whence. Such preachers we must have as either drop down immediately from the heavens, as Diana's image is said to have done by the town-clerk of Ephesus; or else must suddenly rise out of the earth, as Tages, the first sooth-sayer amongst the Tuscans, is reported to have done by some ancient writers. And yet we cannot say of our author neither, as Lactantius did of one Acesilas, (if my memory fail not,) *Rectè hic aliorum sustulit disciplinas, sed non rectè fundavit suam*; that is to say, "that though he had laid no good grounds for his own opinion, yet he had solidly confuted the opinions of others." Our author hath a way by himself, neither well skilled in pulling down nor in building up.

FULLER.—I have plucked nothing down but what would have fallen of itself, and thereby perchance hurt others, (I mean, misinform them,) as grounded on a foundered foundation. In place whereof, I have erected, if not so fair, a more firm fabric, acknowledging that apostolical men did at first found the gospel here; though, to use my words, "the British church hath forgotten her own infancy, and who were her first godfathers;" adding hereto, that, "as God concealed the body of Moses to prevent idolatry; (Deut. xxxiv. 6;) so to cut off from posterity all occasion of superstition, he suffered the memories of *our primitive planters* to be buried in obscurity." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 11.)

This is enough to satisfy any ingenuous person, who preferreth a modest truth before adventurous assertions, having in them much of falsehood and more of uncertainty.

DR. HEYLIN.—From the first conversion of the Britons, proceed we now unto the second, as Parsons calls it, or rather from the first preaching to the propagation. The Christian faith, here planted by St. Peter or St. Joseph, (or perhaps planted by the one, and watered rather by the other, in their several times,) had still a being in this island till the time of Lucius. So that there was no need of a new



conversion, but only of some able labourers to take in the harvest. The miracles done by some pious Christians, induced king Lucius to send Elvanus and Meduinus, two of that profession, to the pope of Rome, requesting principally, that some preachers might be sent to instruct him in the faith of Christ. Which the pope did according to the king's desire, sending Faganus and Derwianus, two right godly men, by whom much people were converted, the temples of the gods converted into Christian churches, the hierarchy of bishops settled, and the whole building raised on so good a foundation, that it continued undemolished till the time of the Saxons.

FULLER.—This is the sum and substance of the story of king Lucius, which the Animadvertor hath breviated, and with whom I concur therein. It never came into my thoughts to doubt the substance, but deny some circumstances, thereof. My own expression is, that the whole bulk thereof “is not to be refused, but refined;” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 20;) and to this I adhere.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, in the summing up of this story, our author, having refuted some petit arguments which had been answered to his hand, (though much mistaken by the way in taking Deiotarus, king of Galatia, for a king of Sicily, vol. i. p. 20,) gives us some other in their stead, which he thinks unanswerable.

FULLER.—I deny not that pope Eleutherius might or did send a letter to king Lucius, but I justly suspect the letter now extant to be but pretended and forged. I never thought (by the way, how came the Animadvertor to know my thoughts?) my arguments unanswerable, but now I say they are unanswered; standing in full force, notwithstanding any alleged by the Animadvertor to the contrary. I confess a memory-mistake of Sicilia for Galatia: and as it is the first fault he hath detected in my book, so shall it be the first by me (God willing) amended in the next edition.

14. DR. HEYLIN.—First, he objects against the pope's answer to the king, that “it relates to a former letter of king Lucius wherein he requested of the pope to send him a copy or collection of the Roman laws; which being at that time in force in the isle of Britain, was but *actum agere*.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 22.) But, certainly, though those parts of Britain in which Lucius reigned, were governed in part, and but in part, by the laws of Rome; yet were the laws of Rome at that time more in number, and of a far more general practice, than to be limited to so narrow a part of their dominions. Two thousand volumes we find of them in Justinian's time; out of which, by the help of Theophilus, Trebonianus, and many other learned men of that noble faculty, the emperor composed that book or body of law which, from the universality of its comprehension, we still call the “pandects.” So that king Lucius, being desirous to inform himself in the laws of that

empire, (whether in force or out of use, we regard not now,) might as well make it one of his desires to the pope of Rome; as any great person, living in Ireland in queen Elizabeth's time, might write to the archbishop of Canterbury to procure for him all the Books of Statutes, the Year-Books, Commentaries, and Reports of the ablest lawyers, though Ireland were governed at that time by the laws of England. For though pope Eleutherius knew better how to suffer martyrdom for Christ's cause, (as our author hath it,) than to play the advocate in another's; yet did not that render him unable to comply with the king's desires, but that he thought it better to commend the knowledge of God's law to his care and study.

FULLER.—One who hath taken but two turns in Trinity-Hall-court in Cambridge, knows full well what pandects are, and why so called. All this is but prefatory: I wait for the answer to the objection still to come.

15. DR. HEYLIN.—In the next place, it is objected, that "this letter mounts king Lucius to too high a throne, making him the monarch or king of Britain, who neither was the supreme nor sole king here, but partial and subordinate to the Romans." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 22.) This we acknowledge to be true, but no way prejudicial to the cause in hand. Lucius both was and might be called "the king of Britain," though tributary and vassal to the Roman emperors; as the two Baliols, John and Edward, were both kings of Scotland, though homagers and vassals to Edward I. and III. of England; the kings of Naples, to the pope; and those of Austria and Bohemia, to the German emperors.

FULLER.—A blank is better than such writing to no purpose. For, First, both the Baliols, in their several times, were (though not *supreme*) *sole* kings of Scotland. So were the kings of Naples, and the king of Austria, (there never being but one, the first, and last, namely, Fredoritus Leopoldus,\*) and the kings of Bohemia in their respective dominions. Not so Lucius, who was neither supreme nor sole king of Britain.

Besides, the Baliols, being kings of Scotland, did never style themselves, or were styled by others, kings of Britain. The kings of Naples never entituled themselves kings of Italy: nor the kings of Austria and Bohemia ever wrote themselves, or were written to, as kings of Germany.

Whereas Lucius (ruler only in the south-west part of this isle) is in this letter made king of Britain,—more than came to his share: an argument that the forger thereof was unacquainted with the constitution of his kingdom. And this just exception stands firm

\* SEB. MUNSTERUS *De Germaniâ*.

against the letter, whatever the Animadvertor hath alleged in the excuse thereof.

16. DR. HEYLIN.—Nor doth the next objection give us any trouble at all, that is to say, that “the scripture quoted in that letter is out of St. Hierome’s translation, which came more than a hundred years after.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 22.) Unless it can be proved withal, (as I think it cannot,) that Hierome followed not, in those texts, those old translations which were before received and used in the western churches.

FULLER.—See the different tempers of men, how some, in point of truth, are of a tenderer constitution than others. The primate [Usher of] Armagh was so sensible of the strength of this reason, that it made him conclude against the authenticalness of the letter.\*

17. DR. HEYLIN.—Less am I moved with that which follows, namely, “That this letter, not appearing till a thousand years after the death of pope Eleutherius, might probably creep out of some monk’s cell, some four hundred years since.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 22.) Which allegation being admitted, (the monk’s cell excepted,) it makes no more to the discredit of the letter which we have before us, than to the undervaluing of those excellent monuments of piety and learning, which have been recovered of late times from the dust and moths of ancient libraries. Such treasures, like money long locked up, is never thought less profitable when it comes abroad. And from what place soever it first came abroad, I am confident it came not out of any monk’s cell; that generation being then wholly at the pope’s devotion, by consequence not likely to divulge an evidence so manifestly tending to the overthrow of his pretensions. The popes, about four hundred years since, were mounted to the height of that power and tyranny which they claimed as vicars unto Christ; to which there could not any thing be more plainly contrary than that passage in the pope’s letter, whereto he tells the king, “that he was God’s vicar in his own kingdom,” *Vos estis vicarius Dei in regno vestro*, as the Latin hath it: too great a secret to proceed “from the cell of a monk,” who would have rather forged ten decretals to uphold the popish usurpations over sovereign princes, than published one only (whether true or false) to subvert the same. Nor doth this letter only give the king an empty title, but such a title as imports the exercise of the chief ecclesiastical power within his dominions. For thus it followeth in the same: “The people and the folk of the realm of Britain be yours, whom, if they be divided, ye ought to gather in concord and peace, to call them to the faith and law of Christ, to cherish and maintain them, to rule and govern them, so as you may reign everlastingly with Him whose vicar you are.” So far the very words of the letter, as our

\* De Primord. Eccles. Brit.

author rendereth them, which savour far more of the honest simplicity of the primitive popes, than the impostures and supposititious issues of the latter times.

FULLER.—I confess some precious pieces of antiquity, long latent in obscurity, have at last broke forth into the light, with no little advantage to learning. But, then, such were entire books; and we know how, when, where, and by whom, they were found out, and brought forth. Whereas this loose letter secretly and slyly slid into the world, unattended with any such circumstances to attest the genuineness thereof. Children casually lost are no whit the less legitimate; and beloved the more, when found and owned of their parents. But give me leave to suspect that babe a bastard, which is left on a bulk, or under a stall; no father being found, or mother, to maintain it. A presumption that this letter of Eleutherius is supposititious.

I confess this pretended letter of Lucius hath something in it, which doth act and personate primitive simplicity, (as that passage of regal power in church-matters,) but more which doth practise the monkish ignorance of later times. There were lately false twenty-shilling pieces, (commonly called “Morgans,”) coined by a cunning and cheating chemist, whose part without the rind was good gold, and would endure the touch, whilst that within was base as but double-gilded brass. Such, this letter of Lucius; some part whereof will endure the test, the other not: the monk who made it pretending something of antiquity, (so to palliate the deceit,) but having more of the novelty of the middle age. He lived in some six hundred years since.

May the reader be pleased to take notice, that the Animadvertor hath silently passed by the strongest argument to shatter the credit of this letter alleged by me, and taken from a phrase unknown in that age, yet used in the letter, even *manu tenere*, “to maintain, or defend.” This the Animadvertor slips over in silence; and that, I believe, for nineteen reasons, whereof this was one,—because he himself was unable to answer it, and knew critics would laugh at him, if affirming those words, in that sense, contemporary with pope Eleutherius. Herein he appears like a Dunkirker, who delights to prey on poor merchants’ ships passing on in their calling; but, meeting an English man-of-war, he can look big, and fairly give him the go-by. He finds it more facile to carp an easy, inoffensive passage, than to confute what hath difficulty and strength of reason therein.

I resume what I said before, and what the Animadvertor hath gainsayed to no purpose; namely, that this story of king Lucius is not to be refused but refined, and the dross is to be put from the

good metal ; or, (as my own words also are,) the good corn therein sifted from the chaff ; and, amongst the chaff, I have cast away this letter. But if the Animadvertor loves to eat both corn and chaff, much good may his diet do him, and let him and horse feed on their loaf together.

18. DR. HEYLIN.—Our author tells us, (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 18,) that he had ventured on this story “with much averseness ;” and we dare believe him. He had not else laboured to discredit it in so many particulars, and wilfully (that I say no worse) suppressed the best part of the evidence, &c.

FULLER.—Can he say worse than “wilfully,” except it be *maliciously* ? Seeing, in my conscience I believe the story of the conversion of king Lucius ; though this letter, and some other circumstances, seem to me improbable.

I entered on this story with this “much averseness,” as finding much difficulty, and fearing not to give satisfaction therein to myself and others.

I see not how it can be inferred from such my averseness, that I therefore “laboured to discredit the story in so many particulars.”

If this be a good consequence, I desire the reader to remember what the Animadvertor hath written in the latter end of the introduction to his Animadversions on my book ; namely, “I must needs confess withal, that I did never enter more unwillingly upon any undertaking, than I did on this.”

May I not then, by the same logic, conclude his endeavouring to disparage my book, because he entered thereon so unwillingly ?

DR. HEYLIN.—The best part of the evidence in the words of Bede ; who, being no friend unto the Britons, hath notwithstanding done them right in this great business. And from him take the story in these following words : *Anno ab incarnatione Domini, 156, &c.* “In the 156th year after Christ’s nativity, Marcus Antonius Verus, together with Aurelius Commodus his brother, did, in the fourteenth place from Augustus Cæsar, undertake the government of the empire. In whose times, when as Eleutherius, a godly man, was bishop of the church of Rome, Lucius king of the Britons sent unto him, *obsecrans ut per ejus mandatum Christianus efficeretur*, ‘intreating by his means to be made a Christian.’ Whose virtuous desire herein was granted ; and the faith of Christ, being thus received by the Britons, was by them kept inviolate and undefiled until the time of Diocletian.” This is the substance of the story, as by him delivered ; true in the main, though possibly there may be some mistake in his chronology, as in a matter not so canvassed as it hath been lately.

FULLER.—I entered a Grand Jury of authors, who mentioned the conversion of Lucius ; amongst whom Bede is one. I *expressed*

none of them, (as I had no cause,) in their words at length; neither can I properly be said to *suppress* any of them, solemnly giving-in their names, and the several dates which they assign to that memorable action.

19. DR. HEYLIN.—Now to proceed unto our author, he tells us, out of Jeffrey of Monmouth, “That at this time there were in England twenty-eight cities, each of them having a *flamen*, or pagan priest; and three of them (namely, London, York, and Caer-leon in Wales) had *arch-flamens*, to which the rest were subjected: and Lucius placed bishops in the room of the *flamens*, and archbishops, metropolitans, in the places of *arch-flamens* ;” concluding, in the way of scorn, “that his *flamens* and *arch-flamens* seem to be flams and arch-flams, even notorious falsehoods.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 22.)

FULLER.—I would not willingly “sit in the seat of the scorner;” (Psalm i. 1;) and if the Animadvertor by his force will thrust me down into it, I will (God willing) rise up again, and leave the place empty to himself to stand or sit therein, *pro libero suo arbitrio*.

I say no more, nor so much, as that worthy knight sir Henry Spelman (so great an antiquary, that it is questionable whether his industry, judgment, or humility were the greatest) hath said on the same subject; who, having learnedly confuted this report of Jeffrey of Monmouth, concludeth with the cause of his mistake, relying on some supposititious epistles.

*Gaufrido autem atque aliis, qui flaminum, archiflaminum, et protoflaminum commento capiuntur, imposuisse videtur Gratiani autoritas, epistolis munita S. Lucii, &c.*—Sir H. SPELMAN *De Conciliis*, page 13.

See! he calleth that *commentum*, which our dictionaries English “a flat lie;” which I have mitigated into “a flam,” as importing in common discourse “a falsehood,” which hath more of vanity than mischief therein.

DR. HEYLIN.—And it is well they do but seem so; it being possible enough that they may seem falsehoods to our author, even notorious falsehoods; though they seem true enough to others, even apparent truths.

FULLER.—They seem so also to learned sir Henry Spelman, lately alleged; and to the reverend archbishop of Armagh, and many others.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, First, though Jeffrey of Monmouth seem to deserve no credit in this particular, where he speaks against our author’s sense; yet in another place, where he comes up to his desires, he is otherwise thought of, and therefore made the foreman of the

grand inquest against Augustine the monk, whom he indicteth for the murder of the monks of Bangor. And, certainly, if Jeffrey may be believed when he speaks in passion, "when his Welsh blood was up," as our author words it, as one that was "concerned in the cause of his countrymen;" (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 93;) he may more easily be believed in a cause of so remote antiquity, where neither love nor hatred, nor any other prevalent affection, had any power or reason to divert him from the way of truth.

FULLER.—It is usual with all authors, sometimes to close with the judgments of the same person, from whom they afterwards, on just cause, may dissent. And should not this liberty be allowed me, to like or leave in Jeffrey Monmouth what I think fitting? The Animadvertor concurreth with bishop Godwin, that "the Druids instructed the Britons in the worship of one God;" yet will not be concluded with his judgment, when averring the letter fathered on Eleutherius not to savour of the style of that age. Yea, when I make for him, he can allege twenty lines together, out of my book, against H. le Strange; though at other times, when he hath served his turn of me, I am the object of his slighting and contempt.

Now whereas the In-animadvertor (for now I must so call him for his carelessness) citeth a place in my book, namely, Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 93, that I "make Jeffrey of Monmouth the foreman of the great inquest against Augustine the monk," he is much mistaken therein. For, in the place by him cited, I empanel a grand jury (amongst whom Jeffrey Monmouth is neither foreman nor any man) of judicious readers, consisting of twenty-four. As false is it what he addeth, as if in that trial I attributed much to the judgment of Jeffrey Monmouth; who therein is only produced as a witness, and a verdict brought in, point-blank against his evidence, acquitting Augustine the monk of the murder, whercof Monmouth did accuse him.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, Secondly, though Jeffrey of Monmouth be a writer of no great credit with me, when he stands single by himself; yet when I find him seconded and confirmed by others, I shall not brand a truth by the name of falsehood because he reports it. Now that in Britain at that time there were no fewer than eight and twenty cities, is affirmed by Beda.\* Henry of Huntingdon not only agrees with him in the number, but gives us also the names of them; though where to find many of them, it is hard to say.† That in each of these cities was some temple dedicated to the pagan gods, that those temples afterwards were employed to the use of Christians, and the revenues of them assigned over to the maintenance of the bishops and other

\* *Hist. Ecclesiast. Angl.* lib. viii. cap. 13.

† *Hist.* lib. i. in initio.



ministers of the gospel, hath the concurrent testimony of approved authors; that is to say, Matthew of Westminster out of Gildas, *anno* 187; Rodolph de Diceto, cited by the learned primate of Armagh in his book *De Primordiis Eccles. Brit. cap. 4*; Gervase of Tilbury, *ibid. cap. 6*. And for the *flamens* and *arch-flamens*, they stand not only on the credit of Jeffrey of Monmouth, but of all our own writers, who speak of the foundation of the ancient bishoprics, even to Polydore Virgil.

FULLER.—I concur with the Animadvertor in the number of the cities in Britain. Also I do not deny but that king Lucius might place bishops in some (perchance half) of them, which I believe is all which the Animadvertor doth desire. Only as to bishops and archbishops exactly substituted in the individual places of *flamens* and *arch-flamens*, my belief cannot come up to the height thereof. I find that Giraldus Cambrensis, and other authors of that age, (though concurring with Jeffrey Monmouth in Lucius's episcopating of cities,) make not any mention of these *arch-flamens*.

DR. HEYLIN.—Nor want there many foreign writers who affirm the same; beginning with Martinus Polonus; who, being esteemed no friend to the popedom, because of the story of pope Joan which occurs in his writings, may the rather be believed in the story of Lucius. And he agrees with Jeffrey of Monmouth in all parts of the story, as to the *flamens* and *arch-flamens*, as do also many other of the Roman writers which came after him.

FULLER.—Nothing more usual than for foreign writers, with implicit faith, to take things on the credit of such who have wrote the history of their own country. But, on the confutation of the leading author, the rest sink of course of themselves.

DR. HEYLIN.—But whereas both our author and some others have raised some objections against this part of the History, for answer thereunto I refer the reader to the learned and laborious work of Francis Mason, late archdeacon of Norfolk, *De Ministerio Anglicano*; the sum whereof in brief is this, *Licet in unâ urbe multi flamines*, “that though there were many *flamens* in one city, yet was there only one which was called *pontifex* or *primus flaminum*, ‘the pope or principal of the *flamines* ;’ of which kind one for every city, were those whom our Historians speak of.” And for the *archi-flamines* or *proto-flamines*, though the name occur not in old Roman writers, yet were there some in power and authority above the rest, who were entituled *primi pontificum*, (as indeed *coifi* by that name is called in Beda,) which is the same in sense with *archi-flamines*, although not in sound. All I shall further add is this, that if these twenty-eight cities were not all furnished with bishops in the time of Lucius, for whom it

was impossible to spread his arms and express his power over all the south parts of the island; yet may the honour of the work be ascribed to him, because begun by his encouragement, and perfected by his example; as Romulus is generally esteemed for the founder of Rome, although the least part of that great city was of his foundation.

FULLER.—But whereas both the Animadvertor and some others conceive their answers satisfactory to such objections raised against this part of the History, I refer the reader unto sir Henry Spelman,\* and to the archbishop of Armagh;† both as learned and judicious antiquaries as ever our land enjoyed.

These, it seems, were not satisfied with such solutions as Mr. Mason produceth against those objections; because, writing later than Mr. Mason, they in their judgments declare themselves against Jeffrey Monmouth herein.

20. DR. HEYLIN.—Our author has not yet done with Lucius. For, admitting the story to be true, he disallows the turning of the pagan temples into Christian churches; which he censureth “as the putting of new wine into old vessels, which afterwards savoured of the cask, Christianity hereby getting a smack of heathen ceremonies.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 24.) But, in this point, the primitive Christians were as wise as our author, though they were not so nice; who, without fearing any such “smack,” accommodated themselves in many ceremonies to the Gentiles, and in some to the Jews; that, “being all things to all men,” they might gain the more, as in fine they did: which notwithstanding, our author hereupon inferreth—

FULLER.—I only humbly tendered my weak opinion herein, that religion was a loser by such mixtures. If it findeth no welcome in the breast of the Animadvertor and others, no hurt is done; let it fairly return into his bosom, who (it seems) first gave it a being, though I could cite most pious and learned authors of the same judgment. But, for the present, let all the weight of the guilt light on myself alone.

21. DR. HEYLIN.—Our author hereupon inferreth:—“They had better have built new nests for the Holy Dove, and not have lodged it where screech-owls and unclean birds had formerly been harboured.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 24.) A pretty piece of new divinity, and such as savours strongly of the modern Anabaptist; such as not only doth reproach the practice of most pious antiquity, but lays a sure ground for the pulling down of all our churches, (as having been abused to popish superstitions in the former times,) if ever that increasing faction should become predominant. What pity is it that our author had not lived and preached this doctrine in king Edward’s time, that, the parochial churches and cathedrals being sent after the abbeyes, “new

\* In his “*Councils*.”

† In his *Primord. Eccl. Angl.*

nests might have been built for the Dove" in some tree or other, under the shade whereof the people might assemble to their devotions! and not "new nests" provided only, but new feathers also,—the vestments prescribed to the ministers by the church of England being condemned and disallowed by the puritan party, because in use formerly with the priests of the church of Rome. More of this stuff, but of a more dangerous consequence to the public peace, we shall see hereafter.

FULLER.—I do not quarrel with the posture of my nativity, knowing "God hath determined the times fore-appointed and the bounds of their habitation," Acts xvii. 23. Nor would I have my being antedated in the days of king Edward VI. whereby my soul should be degraded into a dimmer light, than what now I live in.

Had I lived in his reign, I know not what I would have done, seeing one may be lost in the labyrinth of his own heart. But though I know not what I *would* have done, I know what I *should* have done, namely, persuaded, to my power, all people to be sensible of the vast difference betwixt heathen temples and Christian churches.

The former were the sties of swine; yea, the dens of devils, profaned to the foul idols of Pagans.

The latter were dedicated to the true God, and the memory of his glorious saints, out of zeal and well-intended devotion. And though the same were abused by superstition, yet the *substantial* use of them might remain, when their *accidental* abuse was removed, and might be continued for God's service without any sin; not to say, could not be aliened from it without some sacrilege.

22—24. DR. HEYLIN.—We have now done at last with the story of Lucius, and must next follow our author unto that of Amphibalus; in prosecution whereof he telleth us of a great slaughter of Christians in or near the city of Lichfield, from thence so denominated, of which thus saith he;—

"This relation is favoured by the name of Lichfield, which in the British tongue signifies a *golgotha*, or 'a place bestrewed with skulls.'" (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 34.) It is true indeed that Litchfield, or Licidfield, as Beda calleth it, is made by John Ross to signify *Cadaverum Campus*, or "the field of dead bodies." But that it doth so signify in the British language, I do more than doubt; the termination of the word being merely Saxon, as in Hefen-field, Cock-field, Camps-field, and many others. As little am I satisfied in the etymon of the name of Maiden-head, which he ascribes unto the worshipping of the head of one of those many maidens which were martyred with Ursula at Cologne. (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 60.) For which though he cite Camden for his author, following therein, but not approving, the old tradition; yet when I find in the same Camden, that this town was formerly called

Maiden-hith, that anciently there was a ferry near the place where the town now stands, and that Hith in the old Saxon tongue did signify “a wharf, haven, or landing-place;” I have some reason to believe, that the town took this name from the wharf or ferry belonging at that time to some neighbouring nunnery, or to some private maidens dwelling thereabout, who then received the profits of it. Just so, Queen-Hithe in London took that appellation, because the profits of that wharf were anciently accompted for to the queens of England; and Maiden-Bradly in Wiltshire was so denominated because belonging to one of the inheretresses of Manasses Basset, a most noble personage in his time, who founded a house here for maiden lepers.

FULLER.—As for Lichfield, thereof hereafter. But whether it be Maiden-head, or Maiden-hith, is not a straw matter to me, who cited the words out of Camden’s Latin Britannia; which is more properly Camden, than the English translation thereof.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, to return again to Leitchfield: It must needs seem as strange to my judicious reader, that one part of it should be borrowed from the Britons, and the other from the Saxons; as it seems strange unto our author, and that justly too, that Cern in Dorsetshire should anciently be called *Cernel*, from the Latin word *Cerna*, which signifies “to see,” and the Hebrew word *El*, signifying “God.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 99.)

FULLER.—Nothing more usual than for the same word to bear *parly par pale*,—two languages. But such mixtures only are made in such places where those two languages have entered common together.

And this is the reason that disapproveth the probability of Cern-el, because Hebrew and Latin never incorporated together,—Greek, as I may say, being interposed betwixt them.

But such conjunctions of two languages which, in some sort, indented one another, are frequent and familiar.

Our author lately presented us with two, half-Greek, half-Latin, *archi-flamens* and *proto-flamens*.

He also just now mentioned a word half-French, half-Saxon, *Camps-field*.

Many towns’ names in England are half-Saxon, half-British; *Up-Avon*, *Neather-Avon*, two villages in Wiltshire; *Avon* being “a river” in the British tongue.

To put all out of doubt, the reader may rely on the judgment of this my worthy friend, whose letter I have here caused to be inserted:

“MR. FULLER,

“As touching the etymology of the city of Lichfield, I can give you no satisfactory accompt; being not well skilled in the Saxon tongue. But if Mr. John Ross hath ground for his *Campus*

*Cadaverum*, I conceive he deduced it from the British tongue and Saxon. For in our British language, *Llaith* signifies ‘death,’ as may be seen in several ancient British authors, as Taliesin and others. *Lleithfa* may well bear ‘a place of slaughter,’ as well as *lladdfa*; the word *lladd* in the British is the same with *occidere* in the Latin. *Ma* and *man*, denotes a place: and *Ma* being joined with *lleith* or *lladd*, the *m*, by the rules of the British language, turns into *f*, as *lladdfa*, *lleithfa*, *lladdfaes*. *Maes* is the ordinary name for ‘a field’ in our language; and so the old Saxons, which were not ignorant of our language, might well make use of their own word *field* and join it with the British *lleith*: which, in process and corruption of time, came to be *Litchfield*. You must note, that when the Saxons met with our *ll*, they wrote and pronounced it always as one single *l*.”

25, 26. DR. HEYLIN.—“I fear that learned pen hath gone too far, who makes him founder of a bishopric at York, and styleth him ‘an emperor surpassing in all virtue and Christian piety.’” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 36.) The learned pen here spoken of is that of judicious Camden, whose character of Constantius Chlorus our author in this place will not let pass without some censure. That he did found (or rather re-found) a bishopric in the city of York, I am confident Camden had not said without very good grounds; though on what grounds he said it, I am yet to seek. A bishopric and a bishop of York we find on good record within few years after; Eborius the bishop of that city subscribing to the council of Arles in the time of Constantine, the son and next successor of Constantius Chlorus. And that he was a prince of surpassing virtue, is generally agreed upon by all historians, both Pagans and Christians. The question then will be only this, Whether he did surpass also in Christian piety? which our author will not otherwise grant, but by our Saviour’s argument only, concluding those to be on our part who are not against us; “Constantius doing no other good unto Christianity, but that he did not do it harm.” A censure not agreeable to so good an emperor, who, though he were no “thorough-paced Christian,” yet did he both favour their religion, and protect their persons, as Eusebius testifies *De Vitâ Constantini*, lib. i. cap. 12. And not so only, but, as our author himself confesseth, he both “permitted and preserved them who would rebuild the decayed Christian churches.” If to preserve the persons of Christians in the exercise of their religion, to have them near unto him in places of greatest trust and eminence, to suffer them to rebuild their churches, and defend them in it, be not “the doing of some good unto Christianity,” more than “the doing it no harm,” let our author carry it, and Camden bear the blame of his needless courtship.

FULLER.—If at the end of this long note, the Animadvertor at last had demonstrated that Constantius Chlorus was “a thorough-

paced Christian," the reader and I myself would not have grudged our attention unto it.

But what is the total sum of what he saith? It amounts to just nothing, only to show that (which I confessed) he did some good (besides no hurt) to Christianity. What is this to prove the words of learned (but here mistaken) Mr. Camden? "An emperor surpassing in all virtues and Christian piety."

The Animadvertor should first have proved that this Constantius had *passed into* Christianity before he was *surpassing* therein; a thing which he and all his friends are never able to evidence by any authentic author.

In a word; as *Chlorus* or "yellow" (so his name in Greek) is a middle colour betwixt white and black, below the former and above the latter in brightness; so this emperor (well answering his name) was indeed much better than most Pagans, and yet far short (so far as by any human author can be collected) of a true Christian.

27. DR. HEYLIN.—But this is not the first time, in which our author hath clashed with Camden, and I see it will not be the last, by that which followeth. For, speaking on the by, how wolves first entered into England, considering that "merchants would not bring them, and that they could not swim over themselves," he adds these words: namely, "which hath prevailed so far with some, as to conceive this, now an island, originally annexed to the continent." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 43.) It seems, that though some so conceive it, yet our author doth not. And yet he cannot choose but know that those whom he doth pass so slightly over by the name of "some," (as if not worthy to be notified by their proper names,) are the most eminent and renowned antiquaries of these latter times. Amongst which if I reckon Camden for one, and a chief one too, I should but do him right, and not wrong the rest; whose arguments to prove the point, he that lists to see may find them at large laid down in his description of Kent; which when our author can confute, (as I doubt he cannot,) he may then slight it over a thing "conceived," and conceived only by "some" men not worth the naming. Till then, I shall behold it as a matter not conceived but proved, and so must he.

FULLER.—"It seems:" *Multa videntur quæ non sunt*. I am ashamed to return an answer to this needless and impertinent note. St. Jerome honoured not Cicero more than I reverence Mr. Camden.

DR. HEYLIN.—I should here end this chapter and this book together, but that I find a trifling error not worth our notice, but that I would set all things right as they come before me; which is the placing of the emperor Constantine in the catalogue of those who commonly pass under the name of the nine Worthies: and this, saith he—

FULLER.—Not so. He should have ended this chapter and book before, and not have inserted his last impertinent note. *Num aquila capit muscas?*

28. DR. HEYLIN.—“And this,” saith he, “is more than comes to the proportion of Britain, that, amongst but nine in the whole world, two should prove natives of this island,—Constantine and Arthur.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 66.) That Arthur goes for one of the Worthies, I shall easily grant; and I shall grant too, that in the opinion of some writers this island gave birth unto another of them, namely, Guy of Warwick. “His knight sir Guy, one of the nine, we touch but by the way,” saith Warner in his “Albion’s England.”

FULLER.—Perchance, Guy of Warwick may be made one of the nine *English* worthies. But I believe none ever made him one of the nine *general* worthies; [he being] little known beyond the seas, no general, (not to say prince,) as the rest of his form-fellows, and famed only for his personal performances.

DR. HEYLIN.—But in the common estimate they are reckoned thus; that is to say, THREE JEWS, 1. Joshua, 2. David, 3. Judas Maccabeus: THREE GENTILES, 4. Hector of Troy, 5. Alexander the Great, and, 6. Julius Cæsar: THREE CHRISTIANS, 7. Arthur of Britain, 8. Charlemaine of France, and, 9. Godfrey of Bouillon. But I condemn myself for mingling this poor piece of errantry with such serious matters, though the necessity of following my leader as he goeth may excuse me in it.

FULLER.—The words of the Animadvertor in common estimate intimate, that they are not constantly so accounted. The seven wise men of Greece are variously reckoned up, as several authors fancied them. So also are the nine worthies; and if worth makes a worthy, Constantine deserved a place amongst them, being in time before any, in valour behind none, of the three Christians. Yea, as Sappho is adjected by some to the nine Muses, and made a tenth;\* so let there be ten worthies, rather than Constantine should be excluded. But enough hereof, poets and painters being the most staple authors in this point.

\* *Lesbia Pieriis Sappho soror addita Musis.*—AUSONIUS.



## PART II.

CONTAINING

FULLER'S ANSWER TO HEYLIN'S ANIMADVERSIONS ON  
BOOKS II.—X. OF THE CHURCH-HISTORY OF BRITAIN.

### BOOK II.

*Of the Conversion of the Saxons, and that which followed thereupon  
till the Norman Conquest.*

29. DR. HEYLIN.—In order to the conversion of the Saxons, our author begins (as he had done before in that of the Britons) with the unhappy condition of that people in the state of Gentilism.

FULLER.—Here is an intimation as if I had mistook my epochs in my “Church-History” of Britons or Saxons, or both; beginning them too soon or too late. I avouch it done in due time: and so pass from the Animadvertor’s snarling to his biting.

DR. HEYLIN.—In the description whereof, he omitteth that which was indeed their greatest unhappiness; that is to say, their barbarous and inhuman sacrifices of men and women unto two of their idols. For Camden telleth us of their god called Wooden, that “they used to procure his favour by sacrificing unto him men alive.”\* And I have read in Verstegan, (if my memory fail not,) a man inferior to none in the antiquities of this nation, that, at their return from any conquest, they used to sacrifice the noblest of their captives to their idol Thur. In this not much inferior to the Palestinians, in their sacrifices to Moloch; or to the Carthaginians, in the like abominable sacrifices to Saturn; or to the Scythians, in the like to Diana Taurica; or, finally, to the Gauls, in theirs to Hæsus and Teutates, their own national deities.† But, not to lay at our author’s charge these small sins of omission, we must next see whether he be not guilty of some sin of commission also.

FULLER.—See here the signal charity of the Animadvertor! After he had laid the charge as heavy as he could, (and heavier than he should,) he candidly comes off,—he will not lay to my charge such “small faults of omission!”

I was not bound to particularize in all the Saxon prodigious impieties, all being included in that my general expression,—

\* CAMDEN in *Britannia*, fol. 135.

† LACTANTIUS, lib. xvi. cap. 21.

“abominable” (the proper scripture-word in this case) “in the rites and ceremonies of their adoration.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 81.)

30. DR. HEYLIN.—For, making a general muster of the Saxon gods, and showing how they were disposed of in relation to the days of the week, he concludes it thus: “And thus we see the whole week bescattered with Saxon idols, whose Pagan gods were the godfathers of the days, and gave them their names.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 82.) Not the whole week, though the greatest part thereof, was thus bescattered; Sunday and Monday being so called in reference to the sun and moon, or else in correspondence to the names of *Dies Solis* and *Dies Lunæ*, which they found given by the Romans at their entrance here. For either the sun and moon were worshipped by the ancient Saxons, and then might think themselves neglected in having no place assigned them amongst the rest; or else the Saxon pagan gods were not the godfathers to all the days of the week, as our author telleth us.

FULLER.—It is harsh, that I must be indicted to justify every metaphorical expression; but know, that the word “bescattered” properly importeth some empty intervals, or naked distances, betwixt the things scattered; which otherwise would be covered all over, and not be scattered. If therefore two days in the seven have escaped nomination from Saxon idols, the week notwithstanding may be said “bescattered” by them.

31. DR. HEYLIN.—As much he seems to be mistaken in their god called Woden; of whom thus he telleth us: “Woden, that is, *wood*, *fierce*, or *furious*, giving the denomination to Wednesday, or Wodens-day. Armed *cap-a-pie*, with military coronet on his head, he was the god of battle, by whose aid and furtherance they hoped to obtain victory; correspondent to Mars.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 82.) But Camden sings another song, telling us that Wooden was not worshipped for Mars, but Mercury. “Above all other gods,” saith he, “they worshipped Mercury, whom they called Wooden; whose favour they procured by sacrificing unto him men alive; and to him they consecrated the fourth day of the week; whereupon we call it at this day Wednesday.”\* Thus also, in another place: “Wansdike, in the Saxon tongue called *Woodensdike*, that is to say, ‘the ditch of Wooden or Mercury,’ and, as it should seem, of Woden, that false-imagined god and father of the English Saxons.”† And herein I shall rather subscribe to Camden’s, than our author’s, judgment. For, certainly, had the Saxons worshipped Wooden as “the god of battle, or correspondent to Mars,” they would have given him the third day of the week, or the day of Mars, and not the fourth day of the week, or the day of Mercury; as they gave Sunday and Monday unto Sol and Luna, and Thursday unto Thur, whom they worshipped in the place of Jupiter,

\* In *Britannia*, fol. 135.

† *Idem*, in *Wiltshire*, fol. 241.

ascribing unto him (as the Greeks and Romans did to Jupiter) the power of bearing rule in the air, governing thunder, lightnings, winds, showers, fair weather, &c., as Adam Bremensis, a good writer, doth inform us of them. And though it may be true, which our author telleth us, that “by his aid and furtherance they hoped to obtain victory,” yet this entitleth him not to the place of Mars; as many victories being gotten by wit and stratagem, (the known arts of Mercury,) as by strength and valour.

FULLER.—In describing the Saxon idolatries I followed Verstegan, as the best in this kind, as who (*datâ operâ*) had written on that subject, and who lately by the Animadvertor was styled, (and that very deservedly,) “a man inferior to none in the antiquities of this nation.” \*

However, finding a difference betwixt him and Mr. Camden in this particular, I fairly entered this plain note in the margin of my book; (vol. i. p. 82;) “So VERSTEGAN, page 72, but CAMDEN, *Brit.* page 135, makes him to be Mercury.”

Now either the Animadvertor did not, or did, take notice of this marginal note. *If he did not*, being there tendered so conspicuously to the reader, it is high time for him to leave off writing of books, and turn his pen into prayers; otherwise, such omissions by those who read unto him will, every day, more and more inevitably betray him to, and involve him in, more inconveniences.

*If he did take notice of this note*, (which is most probable, always consulting my margin, when making for his advantage,) he discovered much “superfluity” (not to say of “naughtiness,” James i. 21) *actum agere*, that what I had done before he must do again; and also find fault with me, who had done it before, in this his unnecessary Animadversion.

I will only add, that “the fierce and furious” aspect of Woden, the evidence of his *wild* and *wood* nature, (whence he had his name,) better countenanceth his correspondency with Mars, than Mercury; the latter being concerned to carry a more meek and mild countenance, as who, being of a tamer kind, and acting all by craft and cunning, did not fright, but flatter, deluded people into his plausible designs.

32—35. DR. HEYLIN.—But from our author’s failures in recounting the superstitions of our Saxon ancestors, let us next see how he behaves himself in laying down the story of their conversion. In which, though he ascribe something unto Austin the monk, yet he will by no means allow him to be their apostle: “The papists,” saith he, “commonly call Augustine *the English apostle*, how properly we shall see hereafter.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 81.) And after, “The papists brag

\* In the last page. (384.)

that he was *the apostle of the English*." (*Idem*, p. 101.) In these few words there are two things to be considered: First; whether he is called "the apostle of the English" by the papists only; and, Secondly, whether he were not so both in fact and title.

1. *Not called so by the papists only*, I am sure of that; but called so commonly by as good protestants as our author himself. Thus Camden, a right English protestant: "After this, Augustine, whom commonly they call *the apostle of the Englishmen*, being sent hither by Gregory the Great, having abolished these monstrous abominations of heathenish impiety, with most happy success, planting Christ in their hearts, converted them to the Christian faith."\* Nor doth he speak this only in the voice of the common people, but in another place more plainly, as his own opinion: "A place there is about this shire called Austin's oak, at which Augustine, the apostle of the Englishmen, and the bishops of Britain, met," &c.† Dr. Philemon Holland of Coventry, a good protestant also, making an index unto Camden, speaks the self-same language: "Augustine the apostle of the English;" which is short, but full. Gabriel Richardson, of Brazen-nose, an honest protestant, in his laborious piece called "the State of Europe," telleth us of Canterbury, "that the archbishop's see was founded by king Ethelbert in the person of St. Austin the apostle of the English."‡ More of this kind might be produced, were it not given us for a rule in the holy scripture, *Ex ore duorum testium vel trium*, "that two or three witnesses were sufficient to confirm a truth."

2. The next thing here to be considered is, *whether Austin were not the apostle of the English both in fact and title*. In order whereunto, we must first take notice, that the word, being merely Greek, doth signify, in its natural and original sense, "a messenger, a legate, an ambassador," from whom- to whom-soever sent; and though appropriated to twelve as by way of excellence, yet not improperly communicated unto others in succeeding times, with reference to the nations whom they had converted. So Boniface, an Englishman, the first archbishop of Mentz, is called by Dr. Holland, as by many others, "the apostle of Germany;" Palladius, styled by Camden, "the apostle of the Scottish nation;"§ and the Irish would not think themselves to be fairly dealt with, if their St. Patrick should not be honoured with that title also. In this sense, Austin may be called, and that not improperly, "the apostle of the English nation;" though "a derivative apostle, an apostle" (as our author calls him in the way of scorn, page 101) "at the second hand," though others propagated the gospel further than he lived to do. It was enough to entitle him to this apostleship, that he first publicly preached the gospel, and brought the glad tidings of salvation, amongst the English; though he neither converted all the nation, nor travelled into all parts of the land to attempt the same. Neither St. Paul could be entitled "the apostle

\* CAMDEN'S *Britannia*, fol. 136.

† *Idem* in *Worcestershire*, fol. 578.

‡ RICHARDSON'S "State of Europe," lib. iii.

§ CAMDEN in *Scotland*, fol. 45.

of the Gentiles," St. Thomas of the Indians, nor St. Matthew of the Ethiopians, if it were necessarily required to their apostleships, that all the nations of the Indians must be converted by the one, or the vast countries of the Ethiopians must be converted by the other; or, finally, if St. Paul, to save them a labour, must have reduced all the Gentiles to the faith of Christ. And this the ambassadors for the king of England at the Council of Basil understood right well, when they contended for precedence with those of Castile. For when the Castilians had objected, that although Joseph of Arimathea had preached in England, it was but in a corner thereof, the grand body of Britain remaining pagan many hundred years after; the English ambassadors wisely answered, that the allegation was impertinent to the present purpose, it being *not the universality*, but *the first preaching*, of the Christian faith which gained the name of an apostle; there being no disciple (as they truly urged it) that ever converted a kingdom totally and entirely to Christianity: for which consult our very author. (Ch. Hist. vol. i. lib. 4, pp. 502—507.)

And yet the pains in preaching of Austin were not so limited and restrained to one kingdom only, but that he travelled into most parts of the Saxon Heptarchy, preaching the gospel in all places to which the Spirit did conduct him, or his business lead him. Our author grants him to have converted the kingdom of Kent; (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 86;) and to have taken care for planting the gospel in the kingdom of the East-Saxons, and for that end ordaining Mellitus the first bishop of London. (*Idem*, p. 99.) From hence he carries him to a conference with the British bishops in the country of the Wiccians, (now Worcestershire,) then part of the kingdom of Mercia; (*Idem*, p. 88;) from thence to Richmondshire in the kingdom of Northumberland, where he is said to have baptized above ten thousand in one day; (*Idem*, p. 97;) and, finally, to Cern in Dorsetshire, part of the kingdom of the West-Saxons, where he destroyed the idol of *Heale*, or *Æsculapius*. By which we see, that he visited no fewer than five of the seven kingdoms in the Saxon Heptarchy, not only doing in each of them that particular work which he went about, but preaching in all fit places as he passed along. And this, considered as it ought, with reference to the distance of those several places to which our very author brings him, gives him just title to that honour which our author would so willingly deprive him of, when, telling us how the papists called him "the English apostle," he adds these words, "how properly (so called) we shall see hereafter."

FULLER.—The Animadvertor engageth deeper in this controversy than in my mind it deserveth. To state the difference truly, "whether Augustine properly is called the apostle of the English," we must explain two terms, *apostle* and *English*.

1. Waving the general notation of "apostle" for no more than "a messenger;" in the New Testament it importeth a person immediately sent by Christ, to preach people into salvation. It was

essential to their constitution, either to have accompanied Christ in the flesh, a qualification required by St. Peter in such elects who should supply the vacancy of Judas; (Acts i. 21;) or, at the least, that they should see Christ incarnate, either humbled or glorified; the latter favour being peculiarly afforded to St. Paul: "Am I not an apostle? am I not free? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" (1 Cor. ix. 1.) These I may call "*primitive* apostles;" and none will entitle Augustine the monk to be one of *their* order. A second sort I call "*derivative* apostles;" a term, which though the Animadvertor saith is used by me in the way of scorn, I protest it in sober seriousness, God hath not endowed me to make a more proper expression, signifying such as mediately, and (as I say) "at the second hand," are sent by some eminent servants of God to convert Pagans to Christianity.

2. "English" may be taken in a threefold sense:—

First. For all the nation; (an indefinite, tantamounting to an universal;) and this is the most proper sense of the word.

Secondly. For the greater part of the nation, which in common discourse denominates the whole.

Thirdly. For some part of the nation, which may be made good by a synecdoche, especially justified when it is a chief and first (though least) part thereof, which, κατ' ἐξοχήν, or *per eminentiam*, taketh the name of the whole.

My clear sense is, Augustine the monk may be called "a *derivative* apostle of the English" in the last acceptation of the word; and so Mr. Camden, Mr. Richardson, Mr. Holland, and I doubt not but many more, have and may entitle him.

The Animadvertor measureth the progress of Augustine with too extensive dimensions, making him a greater English traveller than ever he was. Kent was, generally, the sphere he moved in; and from thence he was itinerant to Cerne in Dorsetshire, the boundary of his western travel; no personal achievements by him north of the Thames, seeing that grave baptism (if in Yorkshire) was surely done by Paulinus. As for the interview and conference betwixt him and the British bishops in Worcestershire, (though some probably might be converted in his passage thither, and return thence,) no great advantage, but detriment, to Christianity was thereby occasioned, those parts generally remaining in Paganism.

And here I will tender the reader another distinction of apostles, submitting it to his judgment: They were either of God alone, man alone, God and man together.

First. Of God alone; as St. Paul, (and the other twelve,) "an apostle not of man, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead," Gal. i. 1.

Secondly. Of man alone ; being such as the false apostles amongst the Corinthians, and elsewhere, whose commission was made and drawn up by themselves, sealed and attested by some of their factious admirers.

Thirdly. Of God and man ; and such an apostle was Augustine, sent (as I may say) by God and Gregory to the English nation. But let him not engross the name to himself, but admit also as his partners therein, 1. Mellitus, 2. Paulinus, and Aidan, 3. Felix, 4. Birinus, 5. Chad, 6. Wilfrid,—apostles also, because sent to, and convertors of, 1. The East Saxons, 2. Northumbrians, 3. East Angles, 4. West, 5. Mercians, 6. South Saxons.

36. DR. HEYLIN.—I have spent more time than I intended in defence of this title, and therefore think it seasonable to proceed from the person to his acts : of which the first we meet with is, the fixing of the archi-episcopal see at Canterbury ; for which our author, amongst many other reasons, gives us this for one ; namely, that “ London, by reason of the receipt thereof, was likely to prove the residing-place for the English monarch ; and it was probable that the archi-episcopal dignity would there be eclipsed, and outshined by the regal diadem.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 87.) But here I must needs ask our author, Whether he thinks, that this was really one of those many motives which occasioned Austin to resolve of Canterbury for his seat of residence ? If, “ Yea,” then must our author grant him to be endued with the spirit of prophecy, which I think he will not ; if, “ Not,” then a contingency so remote could not be taken by him into consideration, as indeed it was not. For, First, London ; at that time, was the chief city of the kingdom of East-sex, one of the weakest of the seven, and so not likely to prevail over all the rest. Secondly. If any of the greater kingdoms of Mercia, West-sex, or Northumberland, should in fine prevail, it was not probable that the conquerors would remove the seat-royal from their own dominions into any of the conquered countries. And, Thirdly, though the kings of the West Saxons, who prevailed at last, and became monarchs of the whole, settled the royal seat in London, yet was it not till Winchester, their own regal city, was destroyed by fire, and made unable to receive them.

FULLER.—Other reasons are alleged by me, why Austin chose Canterbury rather than London for his archi-episcopal see. These arguments *juncta jurant*, and will hold in the sheaf, though a single arrow should be broken ; I mean, though this one reason (alleged by me) were disproved.

Austin needed no prophetic inspiration, whilst prudential prevision could sufficiently suggest unto him, that if ever the Saxon Heptarchy terminated (which was most probable) in a monarchy, London might be presumed the principal place of the royal residence, as most convenient for trading, and commodious for situation :



I say London, an infant in the time of Tacitus, a stripling in the time of Austin, a man before the Conquest, and grown a giant in our days.

37. DR. HEYLIN.—“The first cast of his office was to call a council for the Saxon and British bishops to come together, in the confines of the Wiccians and West Saxons.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 88.) Our author placeth this meeting, within a few lines after, in the confines of Worcester and Herefordshire, and more rightly there; Worcestershire, or the country of the Wiccii, confining on the county of Hereford, but bordering in no place on the kingdom of West-sex, the whole county of Gloucester being interposed. So that our author being mistaken in the place of the meeting, it is no wonder if he stumble at the monuments and records thereof. Of one of which he telleth us—

FULLER.—Here is more than an insinuation, as if I, in designing the place of this meeting, had written something contrary to truth, and also to myself, who indeed have exactly followed the best authors in the position thereof.

<p>Bede fixeth it (book ii. chap. 2) <i>in confinio Wicciorum et occidentaliū Saxonum</i>, “in the confines of Worcestershire-men and West Saxons;” and H. Huntingdon hath the same words, lib. iii. page 323.</p>	<p>Mr. Camden makes the oak under which they met, in the borders of Worcester and Herefordshire; and sir Henry Spelman doth concur with him therein.</p>
--	--

If therefore the interposition of Gloucestershire distanceth Worcestershire from confining on the West Saxons, the Animadvertor ought to have vented his displeasure not on me, but on Bede, and Huntingdon, whose words I exactly translated.

May the reader be pleased to take notice, that Gloucestershire, a liminary county, did in that age belong to three dominions: that west of Severn, (now the Forest of Dean,) to the Britons or Welsh; the east part thereof, (chiefly consisting of Cotswold,) to the kingdom of Mercia; and the middle of that county, (along the east of Severn,) to the West Saxons, as I have seen in an exquisite map of the Heptarchy; and this I tender as the most probable expedient to reconcile learned authors amongst themselves, and all to the truth, in bringing Worcestershire and West Saxons together. Thus being critical in stating the place, and laying the scene, I hope I shall be the better believed in relating the acts, of this Conference.

38. DR. HEYLIN.—Of one of which he telleth us, that “we can part with it without any loss to ourselves,” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 90,)

and therefore bids it to make "shift for its own authenticity." (*Idem*, p. 89.) The record slighted thus is a memorial of the answer of the abbot of Bangor, to archbishop Austin's proposition, communicated by Peter Moston, a Welsh gentleman, to that learned and industrious antiquary sir Henry Spelman, and by him placed in his collection of the British and Saxon councils: which honour he had never given it, had he not conceived it worthy to deserve that place; nor "had the papists used such violence to wrest it from us," without the hope of gaining somewhat to themselves.

FULLER.—Had I slighted that record, I would not have taken the pains to have exemplified it in British and English, and procured a prime antiquary of the Welsh to correct it. I have given the true valuation thereunto, esteeming it as highly as Dr. Hammond hath done, thus writing thereof in his "Account of H. T.'s Appendix to the Manual of Controversy concerning the abbot of Bangor's Answer to Augustine:"—"In case this one testimony should be demonstrated to be a simple imposture, we can unconcernedly and easily part with it, standing in no need of this auxiliary." (Page 168.) And, not long after: "The acquisitions of this author (H. T.) hereby, and proportionably our losses, must be so unconsiderable."

For the rest, I refer myself to my Church-History in this particular passage, and stand ready to justify the same, as truly and cautiously written.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, to proceed: this Conference being ended without success, there followed, not long after, the great slaughter of the monks of Bangor; for which our author, in a merrier humour than becomes the sadness of the matter, or the gravity of an Ecclesiastical History, hath caused Austin to be indicted, impanelling a jury, and producing his evidence.

FULLER.—I am sensible of no misbecoming mirth or levity therein. The impanelling of a jury is one of the most solemn and serious of all the proceedings in our law; I preferred this method as the clearest to present all passages to the fancy, and fittest to fix the same in the memory, of the reader.

39. DR. HEYLIN.—Amongst which, Matthew Parker, the learned archbishop of Canterbury, and John Jewel, the renowned bishop of Salisbury, must be rejected by the jury as incompetent witnesses; "partly, because of their known opposition to the Romish church; and, partly, because of their modern writing,—almost a thousand years after the matter in fact." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 95.) And all this done to add the greater honour to Mr. Fox, as modern as either of the two, and as averse as either of them from the church of Rome. But Mr. Fox was Mr. Fox,—no friend unto the rites and ceremonies of the

church of England; whereas the other two were bishops, and great sticklers for them. This makes our author magnify Fox for his moderation; whose "moderate testimony," saith he, "much moved the whole court;" and as much to condemn the others for the "sharpness of their expressions against Austin," (whom our author himself reproacheth often for his pride and haughtiness, *Idem*, p. 92,) which made them of less credit amongst the jury. A thread of which fine spinning we shall find frequently interwoven in the whole web of this History; and, towards the latter end thereof, not a few whole pieces made of no better yarn. And let the reader take this with him for a taste of our author's good affections to the several parties, that it is bare M. Parker and plain bishop Jewel, without welt or guard, but "reverend Mr. Fox" by all means; and so let him pass. And let us pass also to the residue of the acts of Austin—

FULLER.—1. I did not expect that the Animadvertor, being of Magdalen's in Oxford, would have been offended to have heard his collegiate (Mr. Fox) to be commended.

2. The testimonies of archbishop Parker and bishop Jewel are (to hold the balance indifferently) the less valued, because in some sort they were parties, as who (in their writings) had engaged themselves in this present controversy, whilst Mr. Fox stands neuter as to this particular controversy.

3. Though the Animadvertor be pleased to entitle him "no friend to the rites and ceremonies of the church of England," give me leave to add, "and he was no fierce foe against them." "But Mr. Fox was Mr. Fox," and Dr. Heylin is Dr. Heylin.

4. As Mr. Fox hath now the casual favour of my pen to be epitheted "reverend," so afterwards, "without welt or guard," he is plainly called John Fox.\* The Animadvertor in this his slight note, reaping what was not purposely sown, will find little food in what he reaps.

Lastly. Bishop Jewel hath his large and due character of commendation (with all honourable additions with advantage) in due place.† So also hath archbishop Parker, on the same token, that, in my History of Cambridge, (page 26,) I clear him from the scandalous insinuation of Brian Twyne: *Si illis standum sit*, &c., suggesting some unworthy suspicions, as if he had falsified Matthew Paris in his edition thereof.

40. DR. HEYLIN.—"Who all this while was very industrious, and no less successful, in converting the Saxons to the Christian faith: insomuch that a certain author reporteth, how, in the river Swale, near Richmond in Yorkshire, he in one day baptized above ten thousand." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 97.) The certain author whom he means, is an

\* Church-History, book ix. vol. iii. page 91.  
and oft before.

† *Idem*, lib. ix. vol. ii. page 502,

old fragment of a nameless author, cited by Camden, fol. 136, who tells the story otherwise than our author doth. For though the fragment tell us, that the river was called Swale, yet that it was the river Swale near Richmond in Yorkshire, is the addition of our author. That there is a river of that name near Richmond, is affirmed by Camden who withal telleth us, “that it was reputed very sacred amongst the ancient English; for that in it, when the English Saxons first embraced Christianity, there were in one day baptized with festival joy by Paulinus the archbishop of York, above ten thousand men, besides women and little children.”\* Of Austin’s baptizing in this river, not one word saith he. Neither doth Beda touch upon it; as certainly he would have done, had there been ground for it. And therefore, if I may have leave to venture my opinion, I shall concur with the old fragment as to the name of the river, and yet not carry Austin out of Kent, and much less into Richmondshire, to perform that office. For when we find in Camden, that the Medway, falling into the Thames, is divided by the Isle of Sheppey into two great branches, of which the one is called East-Swale, the other West-Swale;† I see no reason why we should look any where else for that river Swale mentioned in the old fragment, which before we spake of. But herein I must submit myself to more able judgments. The place agreed on, we should next inquire into the numbers, but that our author seems to grant as much as the fragment craveth.

FULLER.—I could heartily wish that all the Animadvertor’s book had consisted of such matter, then had it been *greater* though *less*; I mean bigger in benefit, though smaller in bulk, and more instructive to the reader thereof. I did not before take notice of either East- or West-Swale in Kent; and now profess myself the Animadvertor’s convert in this point, agreeing with him, that this grand baptizing (if done by St. Austin) was done in the place by him specified.

But this still doth more and more confirm me in my judgment, that Austin advanced never into Yorkshire, and that the conversion of the Northumbrians was the work of Paulinus and others.

41. DR. HEYLIN.—Only he telleth us, that “if so many were baptized in one day, it appears plainly, that in that age the administration of that sacrament was not loaded with those superstitious ceremonies, as essential thereunto, of crossing, spittle, oil, cream, salt, and such-like trinkets.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 98.) Our author here reckoneth the sign of the cross in baptism amongst the vain trinkets and superstitious ceremonies of the church of Rome, and thereby utterly condemneth the church of England; which doth not only require it in her Rubrics, but also pleads for it in her Canons, not as essential to that sacrament, (the papists not making “spittle, oil, cream, salt,” &c. to

\* CAMDEN in Richmondshire, fol. 720.

† CAMDEN in Kent, fol. 333.

be “essential thereunto,” as our author saith,) but only for a sign significative, “in token that the party signed shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner, against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue Christ’s faithful soldier and servant unto his life’s end.”\* A ceremony not so new as to be brought within the compass of popish “trinkets,” though by them abused. For when the point was agitated in the Conference at Hampton-Court, and that it was affirmed by some of the bishops, that the cross in baptism was used in the time of Constantine; Dr. Reynolds, the most able man of the opposite party, who had before acknowledged it to have been in use, in other cases, from the very times of the apostles, had not one word to say against it.† And, to say truth, no man of modesty and learning could have spoken against it, when it was proved so clearly by Dr. Andrews, then dean of Westminster, out of Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, (each of whom died long time before Constantine’s birth,) to have been used in *immortali lavacro*, in that blessed sacrament. That good old saying of Tertullian, *Caro signetur, ut anima muniatur*, may serve once for all. And therefore when our author telleth us in the following words, that “in that age nothing was used with baptism, but baptism,” it must be considered as a smack of that old leaven which more and more will sour the lump of his whole discourse. We have already had a taste of it in the very first book, we find a continuance of it here, and we shall see more of it hereafter; our author not being coy in showing his good affections not only to the persons of the Nonconformists, but their inconformity; not to the men only, but their doctrines and opinions also. And this is that which we must trust to in the whole course of this History.

FULLER.—This objection hath been answered at large in the “Introduction;” (p. 346;) and here I intend no repetition, only desiring the reader to take notice of those my words, “as *essential* thereunto.”

Let me add, that a curse is pronounced on those who remove the landmarks; (Deut. xxvii. 17;) and it falleth most heavy on them who remove the limits in God’s worship, (as being boundaries of highest consequence,) [who] turn *may* into “must,” *convenient* into “necessary,” *ornamental* into “essential.”

I have as high an esteem for the cross in baptism as the Animadvertor himself, so long as it observes the due distance of an *ancient* and *significant* ceremony, and intrudes not itself as *essential*. A chain of gold is an eminent ornament about the neck; but it may be drawn so close, as to choke and strangle the wearer thereof. And in like manner ceremonies, though decent and useful, when pretending to essentiality, become (as Luther saith) *carnificinæ conscientiæ*, and therefore justly may we beware thereof.

\* Form of Baptism.

† Conference, page 71.

42. DR. HEYLIN.—Having now done with the acts of Austin, we shall not keep ourselves to so continued a discourse as before we did, but take our author's text by piecemeal, as it comes before us, and making such Animadversions on the same as may best serve to rectify the story and maintain the truth; as namely, "Thus the Italian, Spanish, and French, daughters or nieces to the Latin, are generated from the corruption thereof." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 96.) This is, I grant, the common and received opinion; but yet, methinks, our author who loves singularities should not vouchsafe to travel on the public road.

FULLER.—In my passage to heaven, I desire to go in the "narrow path," and decline "the broad way which leadeth to destruction." (Matth. vii. 14.) But, on earth, I love to travel the common and beaten road, as easiest to find, and wherein (if wrong or at a loss) one may soonest find company to guide and direct him.

If I should travel over *the Animadvertisers several* at Lacey's Court, I have cause to suspect he would sue me for *pedibus ambulando*; and it is hard, if also he will not let me go (without carping at me) in the highway or public road.

I build nothing on the highway, (so to trespass upon the lord of the soil,) but only peaceably pass along it: I mean, I make no inferences or deductions from this received opinion, I derive no consequence thence. All that I do, is to gain just advantage thereby to honour the Welsh tongue, by showing that it is "no daughter or niece," (like the Italian, Spanish, and French,) but a mother and original language, and might justly have expected thanks, rather than censure, from the Animadvertiser for my pains, seeing he delighteth to derive himself from British extraction.\*

\* Heylin has occasionally poured ill-timed ridicule on what can be deemed only the imaginary vanity of Fuller; though he was himself in this respect much more culpable. Proud of the height from which he could deduce his Welsh genealogy, Heylin has not indeed attempted, like some of his countrymen, to trace the direct line of his family upwards to Noah; yet he fearlessly claims remote kindred with the most puissant of the princes of Wales. The littleness of undue self-estimation not unfrequently betrays itself in his most admired literary productions, and obscures those better qualities of the heart for which, after all his characteristic warmth of spirit, the old historian will always be the object of affectionate veneration. Take, from his "Cosmography," (folio, 1670,) the description of "the commissioners who were appointed to conclude the differences between Llewellyn II. and king Edward I.:"—

"Robert Lord Tiptoft, and some others, for the king of England; for the Welsh prince, Grono ap Heylin, a great man of that country, descended from Brockwell Skythrac, one of the princes of Powys-land, (from whom, if Camden, Clarendieux, be of any credit, the author of these papers doth derive his pedigree,) under whom that family had the office of *hereditary cup-bearer*, and from thence their name: HEYLIN—*Promus, sive a poculis; quæ vox in proprium nomen abiit*, saith the Welsh Dictionary." (Page 326.)

Lest any one should remain in ignorance either of the lineage or the quality of his

DR. HEYLIN.—For, in my mind, it is affirmed with better reason by our learned Brerewood, “That those tongues have not sprung from the corruption of the Latin, by the inundation and mixture of barbarous people in those provinces, but from the first imperfect impression and receiving of it in those foreign countries.” \* For the Latin tongue was never so generally received in any of the conquered provinces out of Italy, as to be spoken ordinarily by the common people. The gentry and nobility might be perfect in it, for the better dispatch of their affairs with the Roman magistrates, who had the government and lieutenancy in their several countries. And some taste of it might be found with the vulgar also, who, having continual intercourse with the Roman soldiers, and some recourse for trade to the Roman colonies, could not but get a smattering of the Latin tongue. Just so the gentry and nobility both in Wales and Ireland are trained up, for the same reasons, in the English tongue; which notwithstanding could never get the mastery of the natural languages, or gain much ground on those of inferior quality. Secondly. Had these national languages proceeded from the depravation of the Latin tongue, by the mixture of the barbarous nations, it must needs follow, that the Italian had not now been the language of all people in Italy, nor the French of all the nations which inhabit France: *et sic de cæteris*. My reason is, because the Heruli, being settled in those parts which we now call Piedmont, the Longobards more towards the east, the Goths about the middle parts, the Saracens and Greeks in the realm of Naples, there must needs be as many distinct languages in that one continent as there were barbarous nations planted in it, or at the least such different dialects as could be scarce intelligible unto one another. Whereas it is certainly and most plainly known, that there is only one language spoken in all that country, equally understood by all, without so much as any sensible difference in pronunciation; more than is usual in all places between the country villages and the neighbouring citizens.

royal ancestor, Heylin, with amusing gravity, gives the subjoined brief but significant notice of him, in the next page:—“Powys-land, given by Roderick to Mervin his youngest son, chiefly because he was a man of approved valour, and so more fit to have his portion upon the borders. In his line it continued a long time together. Of the successors of prince Mervin, I find no good *constat*, more than of Brockwell Skythrac before remembered.”

In a preceding page he had emblazoned the good deeds of a nearer relation with a zeal not undeserving commendation:—“The Liturgy of the church of England was, by command of queen Elizabeth, translated into the Welsh or British; as the Bible also was, by virtue of an Act of Parliament. But because the Bible then set forth was only in the large church-volume, it was, in the beginning of the reign of king Charles, reduced to a more portable bulk, at the cost and charge of my cousin, Mr. Rowland Heylyn, one of the aldermen of London; who also caused the book called *the Practice of Piety* to be printed in that language, for the instruction of the people; and a Welsh or British dictionary to be made and published, for the understanding of the language.”

To such outbreaks of the pride of ancestry as these, Fuller alludes in the text.—  
EDIT.

\* BREREWOOD'S “Inquiry,” cap. v.



The like may be affirmed of the ancient Gallia, planted on the east side of the Loire by the Burgundians; on the west side of that river, and towards the Mediterranean, the Pyrenees, and the Aquitain Ocean by the Gothic nations; in most other parts of it by the Franks; and yet all speaking (with very little difference) the same one language, which, from the most predominant people, we now call the French. More to which purpose might be said, were not this sufficient.

FULLER.—In this my expression, that “the Italian, Spanish, and French, are generated from the corruption of the Latin,”\* the Animadvertor layeth not so much weight on the term “generated,” as on the word “corruption;” whereas, indeed, whatsoever is generated, must be by the corruption (in some kind) of that whereof it is begotten.

Corruption importeth (as current in common discourse) the abasing of a thing from the purity thereof. Now, it is all one, in effect, and equally doth my work, to dignify the British as an *original*, above those three languages; if they came from the imperfect impression or reception of the Latin, which may be reduced to *the corruption* thereof. Thus the Sibboleth of the Ephraimites,† may, in propriety of phrase, be said to have had its rise and being from the corruption (namely, natural mispronunciation) of the Hebrew word Shibboleth. As for the Animadvertor’s long discourse of the irruption of “barbarous nations,” I will return an answer when at better leisure, beholding myself as utterly unconcerned therein.

Let me add a passage from the mouth of a person present thereat: Bishop Williams, Lord-Keeper, could speak the Spanish very well; but knowing how much it concerned a minister of State to be perfect master of his tongue, declined it in all negotiations. Now Gondomar, in a State-passage, desired him to speak Spanish; and, on the bishop’s refusal thereof, “My lord,” said the don, “do but spoil your good—turning it into scurvy—Latin; and it will make as good Spanish as any in the world.” It seems he was of my mind in this present controversy.

43. DR. HEYLIN.—“The Hebrew, the common tongue of the whole world before it was enclosed” (that is to say, divided) “into several languages.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 97.) An opinion as common as the other, and as weakly grounded; such as I marvel at in our author, who, having travelled over all the Holy Land, should have been better studied in the true nature and original of the Holy Tongue.

FULLER.—It is strongly grounded on convincing arguments, as, God willing, shall soon appear.

\* I request the reader to consult my words, as rendered by the Animadvertor, in the former paragraph.

† Judges xii. 6.

The Animadvertor's marvelling why I am no better studied in the nature and original of the Hebrew tongue, who (as he saith) "have travelled over the Holy Land," moveth me more to admire, that he himself should be so utterly ignorant in the Brazilian, Mexican, Ethiopian, Persian, Indian, and Tartarian tongues; but especially in the China language, one letter whereof he did never understand, although he hath written a general "Geography" of the whole world.

DR. HEYLIN.—Nor is it the opinion only, that this tongue was spoken universally before the flood, and even in Paradise itself in the state of innocency; but that it shall be spoken in the celestial Paradise, the language of the saints in glory.

FULLER.—I will not engage myself in such a point of mere curiosity; yet is it not improbable, that it might be spoken in "Paradise," seeing the word "Paradise," and *παράδεισος* in Greek, is borrowed, as critics confess, from פֶּרֶדִּים the Hebrew word. Besides, it is not probable, that Adam lost his language with his innocence; and that he spake Hebrew after his fall, shall immediately be proved.

Less will I trouble myself what language the glorified saints shall speak in heaven; though I am sure, that *Hallelujah*, "Praise ye the Lord!" is pure Hebrew. When people report unto us improbable passages from foreign far-distant countries, we commonly return, "that it is better to believe them, than to go thither to confute them." But if any have over-confidently affirmed, "that the saints in glory shall speak Hebrew," let us rather labour to go thither to confute them, than here to believe them. Mean time let us here take heed of the malicious language of detraction against our brethren, and of scurrilous and profane language, whereby piety may be dishonoured.

DR. HEYLIN.—Insomuch that some good women of my old acquaintance were once very eagerly bent to learn this language, for fear (as I conceive) they should not chat it handsomely when they came to heaven.

FULLER.—The Doctor's book bears the title of "*Necessary Animadversions*;" but if this be one, let it even serve the reader for his *necessary* use.

Indeed, I have read of Cato, who; having heard some philosophers maintain that the Heathen gods spake Greek in heaven, being past sixty years old, he began to learn the Greek, that after death he might the better converse with them; a project and practice proportionable enough to Pagan principles: the analogy whereof is too applicable to some profane mouths of our age, who by execrable oaths and curses practise aforehand to blaspheme, rendering them-

selves (without their serious and seasonable repentance) in a nearer capacity to discourse with the devils and damned in hell. But of chatting of Hebrew in heaven, this is the first (and I hope it shall be the last) time I shall meet with the expression.

DR. HEYLIN.—Now, for the ground thereof, it is no other than an old Jewish tradition, importing, that this, being the common language of all people before the flood, was afterwards appropriated unto Phaleg (the son of Heber) and to his posterity, because not present with the rest at the building of Babel, and consequently not within the curse of confounded languages.\* But against this it is disputed, First, that it is but a tradition, and therefore of no sure foundation to build upon.

FULLER.—Before we come to the serious examination of the point in hand, I would fain be satisfied what means this marginal note, HEYLIN'S "Cosmography," page 19! What? Doth he allege himself to prove his own opinion? My bad heraldry was never guilty of such a fault,—metal upon metal!

Now that the Hebrew was "the common tongue of the world," before the confusion at Babel, is more than a mere tradition, being backed with many authorities and unanswerable arguments.

Of authorities, we begin with St. Jerome, one who is "many authors" in this point, because of his great and general skill in languages, and who, in his Comment on Zephany iii. 18, affirmeth, *Linguam Hebraicam omnium linguarum esse matricem*; "that the Hebrew is the mother of all languages." *Quæ prius humano generi non immeritò creditur esse communis, ideò deinceps Hebræa est nuncupata.*—ST. AUGUSTINUS, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. x. cap. 1.

To these I will add a jury of public Professors, all of eminent note, since the reviving of languages in the western world:—

1. Mercerus, Professor Parisiensis Regis, in Gen. xi. 1.
2. D. Parcus, Prof. Heidelberg. *in eundum locum*.
3. Rivetus, Prof. Leiden. Isai. iv.
4. Crinesius, Prof. Aldorphini Noricor. *De Confusione Linguarum*, pag. 417.
5. Joh. Buxtorfius, senior, in *Epist. Ded. Thesauri Grammat.*
6. Joh. Buxtorfius, junior, Prof. Basil. *De Origine Primigeniæ Linguæ*, in 4to.
7. Glassius, Prof. Jenæ, lib. iv. tract. 3. *De Nomine Proprio*, pag. 775.
8. Polyander, Prof. Leid. Orat. 18. *in Laudem Linguæ Hebrææ*, pag. 296, 297.
9. Tremellius, *Profess. Heb. Linguæ Cantabrigiæ*.

\* HEYLIN'S "Cosmography," page 19.

10. Fr. Junius, Prof. Heidelberg. in Gen. xi. 1. *Urbis ejusdem, &c.*

11. Whitakerus, Prof. Cantab. Controv. i. quæst. 2. *De Script.*

12. Christ. Beckman,\* *De Prop. Voc. Significatione, pag. 30.*

These authorities are seconded with convincing arguments. Not to insist on some ruins and relics of Hebrew, scattered in all ancient languages, (and therefore Joseph Scaliger hath his last, as surest, recourse to it in his quest after the origination of words,) names imposed on persons before the confusion of tongues are, by the Spirit in Scripture, (the best interpreter,) made to speak pure Hebrew.

Not to instance in ADAM, notoriously known for “red earth,” we take notice of,

1. EVE or *Charah*, so called by her husband, “because she was the mother of all living;” (Gen. iii. 20;) and there is life enough in her name to justify it.

2. CAIN, so called by his mother, rejoicing that she had gotten a man; (Gen. iv. 1;) and the word signifieth “a possession,” though therein she (with many other parents, abused by their own over-affection) promised herself more happiness than was performed.

3. SETH, so named by his mother; “for God,” said she, “hath appointed me another seed,” &c. (Gen. iv. 25;) and signifieth “one put, placed, or constituted.”

4. NOAH, so named by his father, because “this son,” said he, “shall comfort us,” &c. (Gen. v. 24,) as the word doth import.

5. PELEG, the son of Heber, may be presumed born at or immediately after the divisions of the world into languages, and colonies, and brooks “division” in his name, Gen. x. 25.

It is not to be expected, that all the whole sentence (spoken by their parents) should be completely contained in their name; but only that the most operative, emphatical, and expressive word should appear therein.

I am not ignorant that Goropius Becanus, in his book (which is rather smiled at for the wit, than approved for the judgment therein) deriveth all words from the German or Dutch tongue: an handsome and pretty essay, but I believe that the Animadvertor is not of his opinion.

It is one thing, here and there to take a name, and to make it countenance such a sense; and another thing, to charge through and through, so as all names may be demonstrated Hebrew in persons born before the confusion of Babel.

How vain would he prove himself, who from the name of Ahiman,

\* For the elder Buxtorf and Beckman, I am as certain they were, as uncertain where, [they were,] public professors.

one of the giant sons of Anak, (Numb. xiii. 22,) and from some correspondency of height in our language, ["a high man,"] would thence infer, that English was the ancient tongue spoken in the land of Canaan !

But I have stayed too long on this discourse, and refer the rest unto Dr. Brian Walton ; who, in his Preface unto the last and very laborious and judicious edition of the Hebrew and many-languaged Bible, hath no less learnedly than copiously handled this subject.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, Secondly, that it is such a tradition as holds no good coherence with the truth of story ; it being a most clear and demonstrative truth, that the Hebrew tongue was not the language which Abraham brought with him out of Chaldæa and Mesopotamia, but that which he found spoken in the land of Canaan at his coming thither, to which both he and his posterity did conform themselves. Or, had it been the language of Heber, as they say it was, (but most undoubtedly was not,) yet, Thirdly, had this been a privilege conferred on Heber, that he and his posterity should speak the original language without alteration or corruption, it must have been extended to all those of the house of Joktan, which descend from him ; as also to the house of Laban in Padan-Aram, and to the Moabites, and the Ammonites, as the seed of Lot ; and, finally, to the Midianites, Ishmaelites, and Idumæans, descended of Abraham and Esau ; and not be limited and confined only to the house of Jacob. Now, that the language which afterwards was and still is called by the name of "the Hebrew," was spoken vulgarly in the land of Canaan before the coming of Abraham thither, is not affirmed by Brerewood only, but by Scaliger, Grotius, Vossius, Bochartus, (all of them men of great renown for their learned studies,) and by many others of this age. By most of which it is affirmed also, that the name of HEBREWS was given unto them by the people of Canaan, not in regard of their descent from Heber the father of Phaleg, but from Abraham's passing over the river Euphrates, when he came out of Chaldæa with his family to dwell amongst them ; that name in the Canaanitish language signifying as much as *trajiciens* or *transfluvialis* ; and therefore not unfitly given by them to Abraham at his first coming thither. And if the Hebrew (as we now call it) was that holy language which was spoken in Paradise, continued by the patriarchs before the flood, and, after, to the building of Babel ; it must needs seem infinitely strange, that it should be reserved only amongst the Canaanites, accursed in the person of Canaan, (their common parent,) by his grandfather Noah, and so abominated by God for their filthy wickednesses that he resolved to spew them out of their native country, as in fine he did. Or if Abraham brought it with him also, when he came into the land of Canaan, he must needs leave it behind him also amongst the Chaldees, where

he was born, and where his ancestors had dwelt before their removal unto Haran. And yet we know that the Hebrew tongue was so different from the Chaldean, that when the Jews returned from the captivity of Babylon, where they had been accustomed to, and bred up for the most part in, the Chaldean language; they could not understand the very words of the Hebrew text without an interpreter, as is apparent in the eighth chapter of Nehemiah, verses 7, 8. But of this argument enough, let us now go forward.

FULLER.—There be three distinct questions, which the Animadvertor doth purposely huddle together for his own advantage:—

1. Whether the Hebrew was the common tongue of the old world.

2. Whether the Hebrew was so preserved in the posterity of Heber, and so confined to his family, that no other communicated therein.

3. Whether Abraham did bring the Hebrew tongue into the land of Canaan; or rather found it there, as spoken formerly by the natives thereof.

Such as maintain the first, (of the co-evity of the Hebrew with the world and mankind,) are not necessarily obliged to defend the two latter.

I said, and only said, (as neither enforcing it, nor inferring any thing thence,) that “the Hebrew was the common tongue of the world;” and have proved it. The rest I am ready to say; so soon as the affirming thereof shall lie in my way, or make for my work; and then, God willing, I will defend my positions. Till then I will gratify the Animadvertor with no other answer: and that for these reasons: (1.) To show my own liberty, that I am free born, and not bound to lacquey after his Animadversions when I have no business of my own. (2.) To wean him from moroseness, by not indulging too much to his humour therein. Lastly. To spare time, my own and the reader’s pains now, that we may the more seasonably spend them, hereafter, on matter of more importance.

44. DR. HEYLIN.—“As Pitseus a Catholic writer would have it.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 103.) *A Roman Catholic* if you will, but no “*catholic* writer.” And much I wonder that an author so averse from the Church of Rome should give the title of *Catholic* to a stickler in the Romish quarrel; though others of less zeal and prudence do commonly, but inconsiderately, bestow it on them; a title which they take with joy, and from thence suck unto themselves no small advantage. *Adeo probanda est Ecclesia nostra a nomine Catholici, quòd extorquet etiam ab invitis Hæreticis*; \* as is bragged by Barclay. But as pope Gregory, pleading against the patriarch of

\* *Parones. ad Scotos*, p. 99.

Constantinople, who had then assumed unto himself the name of “œcumenical bishop,” advertiseth all the rest of that sacred order: *Si ille est UNIVERSALIS, restat ut vos non sitis episcopi*; \* so may I say with reference to the present case: By gratifying these men with the name of *Catholics*, we do unwittingly confess ourselves to be no Christians, or at least but heretics.

FULLER.—Had I called Pits “a Roman Catholic,” then the Animadvertor would have charged me with a contradiction, of “a Particular General.” To clear all, *catholic* shall be deleted in the next edition, and *papist* placed in the room thereof.

It is no great wonder if my pen, perusing many authors of the Romish persuasion, hath got a smatch of their language. But the danger is the less, seeing the Animadvertor will be my compurgator, that my judgment is not inclined to their erroneous opinions. However, he might have omitted this note, who, in his book against Mr. Sanderson, calleth the whole lump of English papists, “the *catholic* party;” as also he termeth them so in his “View of the Life of King Charles:”—“A necessity lay on prince Charles (then in Spain) of keeping, at that time, a plausible correspondence with the *catholic* party.” (Page 27, the two first lines.)

Nor can he justly condemn that in me, which he committeth in himself.

45. DR. HEYLIN.—“Oxford lays claim to the antiquities of Crekelade and Lechlade, two ancient schools of Greek and Latin, as some would have it, removed afterwards to Oxford,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 114.) The like we find in page 179, where our author telleth us of “two towns on the banks of the Isis, the one called Greeklade, in which the Greek, the other Lechlade, or Latinlade, in which the Latin tongue was taught by philosophers.” Most miserably mistaken in both places. For though Crekelade or Grekelade may import a study of Greek philosophers, as some are ready to believe; † yet certainly Lechlade in no language will signify the like study of the Latin tongue. The country people, as it seems, do better understand themselves than our author doth; amongst whom there is a common tradition, that Crekelade was a University of Greek philosophers, Lechlade of *leches*, or physicians, as the name doth intimate; and Latten, a small village betwixt both, to be the place of study for the Latin tongue. But though the people are mistaken in the etymon of the name of Lechlade, yet are they not so far out as our author is, in making Lechlade or Latinlade to be both the same place and of the same signification; whereas, in truth, that town is so denominated from the river Lech, which, arising in the hills of Cotswold, passeth first by Northlech, from thence to Eastlech, and finally falleth into the Thames near St. John’s Bridge, in this parish of Lechlade. As for the

\* GREGORIUS M. *Epist.* 70.

† CAMDEN in Wiltshire, 241.



University of Oxford, which from hence took beginning, as our author hath it, and the antiquity thereof, I shall not meddle at the present; though our author, forgetting the subject which he was to write of, takes all occasions to hook-in every old tradition, (though less probably grounded,) to justify the seniority of the younger sister.

FULLER.—I live and learn, being in this particular beholden to the Animadvertor. It seem there be three places near one another:—1. Crekelade, where Greek is reported professed. 2. Leechlade, where Physic is reported professed. 3. Latten, where Latin is reported professed.

The last of these I never heard of before, and since have never seen in any map; (Shoxton's, Camden's, Speed's;) so that it seems an inconsiderable village. However, my next edition, God willing, shall be reformed accordingly. And yet I might justly discount this my mistake, and make it go for nothing, by setting another of the Animadvertor's over against it; when, in the close of his last note, he informeth us, that the river Lech falleth into the Thames in the parish of Lechlade: whereas Thames is more than eighteen miles from Lechlade by land, (and thirty by water,) not taking the name until the confluence of Tame with Isis, near to Dorchester in Oxfordshire. This small error I had passed over in silence, but because I have to do with an adversary who lieth at catch for the least advantage; and therefore he ought not to be offended, if I return him the same measure I receive from him.

46. DR. HEYLIN.—“Deira, whence, some say, Deirham or Durham, lay betwixt Tees and Humber.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 117.) More out of this, than in his Lechlade or Latinlade, which before we had. For, First, Durham is not so called *quasi Deirham*.

FULLER.—It seems that the Animadvertor playeth always at *in and in*, and I, alas! at *out and out*; but herein I am not out one hair's breadth, as soon will appear.

DR. HEYLIN.—Our learned antiquary gives us a better and more certain derivation of it: “The river,” saith he, “as though it purposed to make an island, compasseth almost on every side the chief city of this province, standing on a hill, whence the Saxons gave it the name of Dunholm. For as you may gather out of Bede, they called an hill *dun*, and a river-island *holme*. Hereof the Latin writers have made *Dunelmum*; the Normans, *Duresme*; but the common people, most corruptly, *Durham*.”

FULLER.—“Our learned antiquary” (though here not named) doth name himself, even Mr. Camden. I ever did and do believe, that he giveth the true denomination of Durham, so called from Dunholm.

But let me add, that I may lawfully, without the least fault, give in also another etymology, (though not true, yet probable,) which I meet with in perusing of several writers.

Mercator, in his Description of Italy, saith, "Some will have it so called *quasi Vitulia*, from *the fairest and fattest calves* bred therein;" though I believe, that he himself did not believe it to be true, but only relates it as he found it in Festus. I may challenge the like liberty of presenting etymologies of places, as tendered to me by other authors.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, Secondly, (which mars all the matter,) the bishopric of Durham was not in the kingdom of Deira, as being wholly situate on the north side of the Tees, and consequently part of the realm of Bernicia; which makes our author's mistake in another place the more remarkable, where, speaking of the kingdom of Deira, he gives us this comment in the margin, namely, "What this day is the bishopric of Deirham or Durham." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 78.)

FULLER.—Be it here rather repeated than inserted, that in the Saxon Heptarchy liminary counties did march and retreat, dilated and contracted by their princes' success.

As for the bishopric of Durham, (though sometimes it might belong to Bernicia,) yet generally it was the north-east boundary of the kingdom of Deira; as in the archbishop of Armagh doth plainly appear: "Deiri possessed Lancashire, Yorkshire, Westmoreland, Cumberland, Bishopric of Durham."—*De Brit. Eccles. Primord. pag. 395.*

Let me add, that he is as exact (even to fractions) as any who ever wrote of the partage of the Saxon Heptarchy.

DR. HEYLIN.—But as long as "some say so," all is well; though who those *some* are, (except our author,) I can no where find. Only I find, that as it is held necessary for a NO-BODY to be in all great houses, to bear the blame of such mischances as by the carelessness of servants and the inconsiderateness of children do too often happen; so is it no less necessary, that there should be a SOME-BODY also in all great undertakings, to bear the blame of such misfortunes as our adventurers-at-wit do as often meet with.

FULLER.—What if he "can no where find it," doth it therefore follow that it is not to be found? Will he presume that his own reading is adequate to things being?

This *nobody*, so much derided by the Animadvertor, will at last appear *somebody*, even Mr. John Fox: "Deira, a part of North-Saxons; whereof, as it is thought, that which we now call Deirham taketh his name." "Acts and Monuments," page 149, last edition.

Thus, reader, I have discharged myself from all appearance of

fault, by producing my author, a learned and able historian, how meanly soever the Animadvertor may be pleased to esteem him.

47. DR. HEYLIN.—And such a SOME-BODY as this, our author hath found out to be the father of another conceit of his concerning Tyburn, (that I may take-in this also whilst it is in my mind,) of which he tells us, that “some have deduced the etymology of Tyburn from *ty* and *burne* ;” because forsooth the lord Cobham was there “hanged and burnt.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 489.) Whereas, indeed, it was so named from the Tey, or Teybourn, a small brook passing near unto it in the former times. Which brook or bourn, arising not far from Paddington, hath since been drawn into several conduits for the use of the city.

FULLER.—I have heard of the Animadvertor’s etymology, and believe it probable. I have also been informed, from good antiquaries, that the true name is Twey-born, from two little brooks (wherewith it is insulated in the winter) running near to it.

The deduction of Tye-born, *aliàs* “I burn,” from burning of Lollards, I protest I did read in Harpsfield, and it is none of my own invention.

48. DR. HEYLIN.—“A place so marked, being foretold fortunate to Æneas to found Alba (since Rome) therein.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 146.) A passage as well stored with errors as the rest before, and such a piece of fine new learning as never any antiquary had found out till now. For, First, Æneas was not the founder of Alba, though that the place designed unto him for the seat of his kingdom. The building of that city was the work of Ascanius, as we find in Virgil :—

*At puer Ascanius — regnumque a sede Lavini  
Transferet, et Longam multâ vi muniet Albam.*

That is to say,

“Ascanius from Lavinum shall translate,  
To Alba strongly-fenced, the regal state.”

And, Secondly, Alba was not built in the place where Rome since stood, but *duodecimo ab urbe lapide*, “about twelve miles off.” For though the river Tiber, in some ancient writers, hath the name of Albula, yet I never found in any writer, either old or new, (till I encountered it in our author,) that Rome was anciently called Alba.

FULLER.—Rather than any difference shall arise betwixt us about this matter, the parenthesis (“since Rome”) shall be altered into (“near Rome”), and then I hope all shall be right and straight beyond exception.

49. DR. HEYLIN.—“It is admirable to consider what shoals of people were formerly vented out of Cimbrica Chersonesus, take it, in the largest extent, for Denmark, Norway, and Swedeland.” (Ch. Hist.

vol. i. p. 159.) And in the largest extent it is taken indeed, such as no author ever gave it before this time. The Cimbric Chersonese, truly and properly so called, comprehended only those parts of the kingdom of Denmark which we now call Jutland, divided by the river Eydore [Eyder] from the dukedom of Holstein. Ortelius and some late geographers make it to take up all that *languet*, or “piece of land,” on the north of Germany, extended from the river Albis in the south, and stretching northward to that part of the ocean which leads into the narrow strait or passage now called Sundt. But never any, till our author, extended this name over those great kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Swedeland, or unto any part of either beyond the Sundt. And yet he had need stretch it a great deal further before he can find a place in it for his Huns and Vandals; of which the first inhabited in Asia, beyond the fens of Mæotis; the last upon the coast of the Baltic Sea in Germany, now the dukedom of Mecklenburgh.

FULLER.—That Denmark, Norway, and Swedeland, are a chersonesus, or “almost an island,” the Animadvertor will not deny. But that I called them the Cimbrian Chersonese, cannot clearly be collected from those my words, “take it in the largest extent;” which amount only to a concession, to such who have a mind so to accept it, and to extend the bounds thereof.

Here plainly to discover my judgment, I conceive that those shoals of people *did not*, and yet *did*, come out of the Cimbric Chersonese, in the strict and true acceptation thereof.

They did not; that is, they came not thence, as having all their birth therein. Jutland, not so big as Yorkshire, and the *languet* the Animadvertor speaks of, not bigger than Wales, being hives too little to hold such swarms and casts of people.

Yet I believe they did come out of that Chersonese immediately; it being most probable, that, out of the opposite continent of Norway and Swedeland, they crossed the Baltic Sea, being narrowest thereabouts, and so came into Jutland, and thence inunded the most of Europe.

50. DR. HEYLIN.—“*Datum in Grantcestrid, anno ab Incarnatione Domini 915, venerabili fratri Frithstano, civitatis scholarium Cantabrig. Cancellario, et Doctori per suum,*” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 190.) These words are the conclusion of an ancient charter, supposed to have been given to the scholars of Cambridge by king Edward the elder; against which our author fancies one objection, which he thinks easy to be answered, but utterly leaves out another, which I think unanswerable. The objection which our author makes against it, is the barbarous style and language of it; which, if it be a good objection against this charter, will be as strong against all the charters of this age, as some ages following, in which there was but little of

the elegancies of the Latin tongue. And therefore this objection might have well been spared, but that our author would be thought to deal very equally in the business, by saying all that might be said against himself.

FULLER.—I plead my last general answer, (page 296,) discharging myself, because I did there charge my margin with two authors, (besides Clare-Hall in Cambridge, where this charter is extant,) Thomas Rudburn, and John Rouse of Warwick. I did not engage with any earnestness for the charter: *per me si non valeat, valeat*. Yet let me add, that the following arguments of the Animadvertor are so far from shattering, they do not shake, the credit thereof.

DR. HEYLIN.—But yet I have another objection which he takes no notice of, because not so easy to be answered; which is, that Frithstan (whatsoever he was) is here honoured with the degree of Doctor, and the title of Chancellor. But, First, I would fain know where Frithstan took the degree of Doctor, and in what faculty he took it; that title in those early days being so unusual, as hardly to be found amongst the attributes of the learnedest men. Secondly. I conceive it to be very hard, I had almost said impossible, for him to prove, that the chief officer of Cambridge (admitting it at that time for a place of learning) had the name of Chancellor. When I shall see some proof of this, and some satisfaction, I shall give some credit to the charter; till then, none at all.

FULLER.—The name of Doctor is threefold. First. For a teacher at large, extant in scripture: “Art thou a Doctor in Israel, and knowest not these things?” John iii. 10.

Secondly. As a title of dignity fixed, by a society of learned men, on some eminent person amongst them.

Thirdly. For one solemnly and ceremoniously graduated by a Professor in some particular faculty; and the word in this sense is not of so great seniority.

I take Doctor in this charter in the second acceptation thereof.

And here I cannot but commend the wariness of the Animadvertor's words, that “the title of Doctor is hardly to be found in those early days.” He hath read the rule of grammarians: *Quod ferè fit, non fit; quod vix fit, fit*; “What is *almost* done, is not done; what is *scarcely* or *hardly* done, is done.” He knew that the title of Doctor began to come into request in that age.

Thus Bale and Pits, (but both of them, as they confess, taking their word from a better antiquary, J. Leland,) writing of Bridfertus, contemporary with our Frithstan in the same generation, dying about the year 980: *Monachus et Doctor Anglus in Cænobio Ramsiensi*.

As for the name Chancellor, it was (as in sir H. Spelman's

“Glossary” doth appear) used, at and before this time, by the Saxons, for a prime officer, (though generally the secretary,) and therefore no such improbability that the chief of Cambridge might be so denominated. Our author proceeds:—

51. DR. HEYLIN.—“Cambridgeshire-men claim an ancient (now antiquated) privilege, to lead the van in all battles.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 214.) Zealous alike, not only for the University, but the county, of Cambridge; his zeal in both transporting him beyond his knowledge into dark adventures. Some authors he pretends to, for the University; for this privilege, none,—telling us only that he hath read it, though he know not where. But I can tell him when and where I have read the contrary; that is to say, in learned Camden, who ascribes this honour to the Kentish. For this he cites not only the authority of a nameless monk, but the words of Johannes Sarisburiensis in his *Polycraticon*, which are these that follow: “For good desert,” saith he, “of that notable valour which Kent showed so puisantly and patiently against the Danes, it retaineth still unto these days in all battles the first and fore-ward, yea, and of the first conflict with the enemy.” \* And if this privilege was given the Kentish for their valour showed against the Danes, it could neither be given to the men of Cambridgeshire, as our author would, nor on the same occasion as he saith it was.

FULLER.—I have read, that when, at the taking of a city by the Romans, two soldiers contended for the crown-mural, (each pleading he first scaled the walls,) that the general caused two crowns-mural to be made; affirming, that, on serious examination of all circumstances, both appeared to him mounting the walls in the same moment; and so, rewarding them both, prevented a mutiny of part-taking in the army.

This controversy is not capable of the same expedient, seeing one cannot make two vans at once in the same army, yet may we distinguish of several times, and accommodate the contest.

King Arthur, in his time, gave the conduct of the front to the Cornish:—

*Nobilis Arthurus nobis dat primitus ictum.* †

Cambridgeshire might afterwards have that honour conferred on them: the words of Brimpton, though not cleaving the pin, touch the mark in this point: *Undè, Anglis regnantibus, laus Cantabrigiensis provinciæ splendidè florebat.* ‡

Yet the dignity being but temporary, and disposable at the prince's pleasure, in reward of new services, the Kentish had it afterward bestowed on them, and for a long time enjoyed it. Our author proceeds:—

\* CAMDEN, in Kent, p. 324.

† CAREW, in Cornwall.

‡ Chronicon, p. 887.

52. DR. HEYLIN.—“It did not afterwards embolden him to the anticipation of the crown,—attending till it descended upon him.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 217.) He speaks this of king Edward the Confessor, who, had he tarried “till the crown had descended on him,” might possibly have found a place amongst the Confessors, but not amongst the kings, of England. For the truth is, the right title to the crown was at that time in Edward surnamed “the outlaw,” the eldest son of Edmund Ironside, who, flying into Hungary to avoid the fury of the Danes, married the king’s sister of that country, and was by her the father of Edgar Atheling, and of Margaret, wife to Malcolm Conmor king of the Scots. But, these being absent at that time, Emma, the mother of prince Edward, and widow to Canutus the Dane, took the opportunity to set her son upon the throne, as being not only half-brother to king Edmund Ironside, but also half-brother, and consequently nearest kinsman, to Canutus II.; which, if it were a good descent, will plead almost as strongly for king Harold as it did for him.

FULLER.—My words are true, and not subject to just exception, which I confined only to king Edward’s relation to his own brethren. The legend of his Life reports him to be crowned, when unborn, in his mother’s belly, and having six elder brethren by the same father, king Ethelred:—1. Ethelstan, 2. Egbert, 3. Edmond, 4. Edred, 5. Edwy, 6. Edgar. Some of which came to the crown, others died in their minority. King Edward (though thus pre-crowned) did not endeavour to antedate his possession of the throne before his elder brethren, but waited till the title (as it was derived unto him from his father) “descended on him.” Otherwise I advocate not for him, if he took it from any other, who had more right to it than himself.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, by what means soever he got the crown, he deserved to wear it.

FULLER.—I cannot cordially close with the Animadvertor’s expression herein, being sensible of no desert, which in this case is not attended with a true title. For who shall judge of the desert of competitors? If the person himself, then every usurper will cry up his own worthiness. If his party, they will make him most meriting whom they favour most in their fancies. This will unsettle all states, cassate all titles, and cause much distraction. But believing no ill at all intended in these his words, let us proceed:—

53, 54. DR. HEYLIN.—Our author telling us, that “whereas formerly there were manifold laws in the land,—made, some by the Britons, others by the Danes, others by the English, &c. he caused some few of the best to be selected, and the rest, as captious and



unnecessary, to be rejected; from whence they had the name of the Common Laws." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 217.) That the Common Law was so called, because compounded of the Saxon, British, and Danish laws, which were before of force only in such places where the Danes, Britons, and Saxons had the greatest sway; though it be easy to be said, will be hard to be proved. The Britons at that time lived under their own princes, and were governed by their own laws, and so they were for a long time after; so that king Edward, having no dominion over them, could not impose a law upon them. Nor was it probable that he should borrow any of their laws, or impose them on his natural subjects, considering the antipathy and disaffection betwixt the nations. There were indeed at that time in England three kinds of laws: the First called *Dane-lage*, or "the Danish laws," prevailing for the most part in the kingdom of the East Angles and that of Northumberland: Secondly. *Saxon-lage*, used generally in the kingdoms of the West Saxons, East Saxons, South Saxons, and that of Kent: and, Thirdly, *Mercen-lage*, extending over all the provinces of the kingdom of Mercia. As for the Britons of Cornwall and Cumberland, they had no distinct law for themselves, (as had those of Wales,) but were governed by the laws of that nation unto which they were subject. By these three sorts of laws were these nations governed in their several and respective limits; which, being afterwards reduced into one body, and made common equally to all the subjects, did worthily deserve the name of the "Common Law." But, Secondly, I dare not give the honour of this action to king Edward the Confessor. The great Justinian in this work was another Edward, called, for distinction's sake, king Edward the elder, who began his reign *anno* 900, almost a hundred and fifty years before this Confessor, to whom our author hath ascribed it. But the truth is, that these laws being suppressed by the Danish kings, who governed either in an arbitrary way, or by laws of their own country, they were revived and re-inforced in the time of this Edward, from whence they had the name of "Edward the Confessor's laws," and by that name were sued and fought for in the time succeeding; of which more hereafter. Now as this work may be ascribed to his love to justice; so from his piety, his successors derive as great a benefit of curing the disease which from thence is called the King's Evil, which some impute (as our author tells us) to secret and hidden causes.

FULLER.—This long note might well have been boiled down from a gallon to a gill, to make it more cordial. If the reader can pick any information out of it, much good may it do him. Let the honour of so good a deed, with all my heart, be parted betwixt the two Edwards,—one the beginner, the other the finisher thereof. Our author proceeds:—

55. DR. HEYLIN.—"Others ascribe it to the power of fancy and an exalted imagination." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 224.) Amongst which

“others,” I may reckon our author for one ; he had not else so strongly pleaded in defence thereof. But certainly what effect soever the strength of “fancy and an exalted imagination,” as our author calls it, may produce in those of riper years, it can contribute nothing to the cure of children. And I have seen some children brought before the king by the hanging sleeves, some hanging at their mothers’ breasts, and others in the arms of their nurses, all touched and cured without the help of any such fancies or imaginations as our author speaks of.

FULLER.—If I be reckoned amongst them, I am mis-reckoned ; for though I conceive fancy may much conduce, *in adultis*, thereunto, yet I believe it partly miraculous, as may appear by my last and largest insisting thereon. I say *partly*, because a complete miracle is done presently and perfectly ; whereas this cure is generally advanced by degrees, and some days interposed.

56, 57. DR. HEYLIN.—Others less charitably condemn this cure as guilty of superstition, quarrelling at the circumstances and ceremonies which are used. And this they do, saith he, “either displeased at the Collect, (consisting of the first nine verses of the Gospel of St. John,) as wholly improper, and nothing relating to the occasion,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 225.) Our author tells us, more than once, of his being “a Clerk of the Convocation ;” (vol. iii. pp. 405—411 ; ) but I find by this, that he never came so high as to be “Clerk of the Closet.”

FULLER.—I never was (nor the Animadvertor neither) “Clerk of the Closet :” *non tanto me dignor honore*. But I have had the honour to see the king solemnly heal in the choir of the cathedral of Salisbury ; though, being so long since, I cannot recover all particulars.

DR. HEYLIN.—Which had he been, he would not have mistaken the Gospel for a Collect ; or touched upon that Gospel which is less material, without insisting on the other which is more pertinent and proper to the work in hand ; or suffered the displeased party to remain unsatisfied about the sign of the cross made by the royal hands on the place infected, (as it after followeth,) when there is no such crossing used in that sacred ceremony ; the king only gently drawing both his hands over the sore at the reading of the first Gospel.

FULLER.—I fully satisfy the displeased party (if he be not through weakness nor wilfulness incapable thereof) about the sign of the cross, in those my words immediately following :—“All which exceptions fall to the ground when it shall be avowed, that the king’s bare hands, notwithstanding the omission of such ceremonies, have effected the healing.”

Take it, pray, as since it is set down in more ample manner in a

late book;\* which I know not whether it be more learned in itself or useful to others:—

“All along king Edward VI. and queen Elizabeth’s reign, when the *strumosi*, such as had the king’s evil, came to be touched, the manner was then, for her to apply the sign of the cross to the tumour;† which raising a cause of jealousies, as if some mysterious operation were imputed to it, that wise and learned king, not only (with his son the late king) practically discontinued it, but ordered it to be expunged out of the prayers relating to the cure, which hath proceeded as effectually, that omission notwithstanding, as ever before.”

58. DR. HEYLIN.—But that both he and others may be satisfied in these particulars, I have thought fit to lay down the whole form of prayers and readings used in the healing of that malady in this manner following:—

#### THE FORM OF THE SERVICE AT THE HEALING OF THE KING’S EVIL.

The first Gospel is exactly the same with that on Ascension day. At the touching of every infirm person, these words are repeated, “They shall lay their hands on the sick, and they shall recover.”

The second Gospel begins the first of St. John, and ends at these words, “Full of grace and truth.” At the putting the angel about their necks were repeated, “That Light was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.”

“Lord, have mercy upon us.

“Christ, have mercy upon us.

“Lord, have mercy upon us.

“Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, &c.

“*Minister.*—O Lord, save thy servants,

“*Answer.*—Which put their trust in thee.

“*Minister.*—Send unto them help from above,

“*Answer.*—And evermore mightily defend them.

“*Minister.*—Help us, O God our Saviour;

“*Answer.*—And for the glory of thy name’s sake deliver us, be merciful unto us sinners for thy name’s sake.

“*Minister.*—O Lord, hear our prayer;

“*Answer.*—And let our cry come unto thee.”

#### THE COLLECT.

“Almighty God, the eternal Health of all such as put their trust in thee, hear us, we beseech thee, on the behalf of these thy servants, for whom we call for thy merciful help, that they receiving health may

\* H. LE STRANGE, “Alliances of Divine Offices,” page 250.  
DR. TUCKER’S *Charisma*, page 109.

† As appears in

give thanks unto thee in thy holy church, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

"The peace of God," &c.

This is the whole form, against which nothing is objected, but the using of the words before-mentioned at the putting-on of the angel; the pertinency whereof may appear to any who consider that "the Light which was the true Light, and lighteth every man which cometh into the world," did not shine more visibly, at the least more comfortably, upon the people, than in the healing of so many sick, infirm, and leprous persons, as did from time to time receive the benefit of it. But it is time I should proceed.

FULLER.—I perceive by this Office, that I have mistaken the Gospel for the Collect; which in the next edition (God willing) shall be rectified. Our author proceeds:—

59. DR. HEYLIN.—"These chose Harold to be king; whose title to the crown is not worth our deriving of it, much less his relying on it." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 229.) A title not so despicable as our author makes it, nor much inferior unto that by which his predecessor obtained the kingdom. Harold, being son to Earl Godwin, (the most potent man of all the Saxons,) by Theyra, the natural daughter of Canutus the first, was consequen brother by the whole blood to Harold Harfagar, and brother by the half-blood to Canutus the second, the two last Danish kings of England. In which respect being of Saxon ancestry by his father, and of the Danish royal blood by his mother, he might be looked on as the fittest person in that conjuncture to content both nations. But, whatsoever his title was, it was undoubtedly better than that of the Norman, had either his success been answerable, or his sword as good.

FULLER.—It was "a despicable title," even after the Animadvertor hath befriended it with his most advantageous representing thereof,—1. From his father, Earl Godwin, the most potent man of Saxon ancestry. 2. From his mother, Theyra, the natural daughter of Canutus the first.

As to his paternal title, if his father's potency was all can be alleged for it, any oppressor hath the same right.

His maternal title, if from Canutus's *natural* (understand *base*) daughter, openeth a door (as I may say) for all who come in by the window.

Besides, the Animadvertor is much mistaken in the name of his mother, seeing Mr. Camden saith, *E Githâ Suenonis regis Danici sorore natus fuit* : \* "He was born of Githa, sister to Sweno king of Denmark."

\* *Britan. Lat.* pag. 104.

DR. HEYLIN.—Upon occasion of which Conquest, our author telleth us that “this was the fifth time wherein the south of this island was conquered: First. By Romans. Secondly. By Picts and Scots. Thirdly. By Saxons. Fourthly. By the Danes. And, Fifthly, by the Normans.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 230.) But this I can by no means yield to; the Scots and Picts not being to be named amongst those nations who subdued the south part of this island. That they did many times harass and depopulate the south part of it, I shall easily grant; but to the subduing of a country, there is more required than to waste and spoil it; that is to say, to fix their dwelling and abode (for some time at least) in the country conquered, to change the laws, alter the language, or new-mould the government; or, finally, to translate the sceptre from the old royal family to some one of their own. None of which things being done in the invasions of the Scots and Picts, they cannot properly be said to have “subdued” the south parts of the island, as our author, out of love perhaps to the Scots, would persuade the reader.

FULLER.—I confess, of all five, the Picts and Scots had the most short and uncertain abode in the south. The distinction is very nice, betwixt *harassing* or depopulating of a country and *subduing* it. If I could but harass and depopulate (that is, but *de-argumentate*) the Animadvertor’s book against me, I doubt not but I should be accounted to subdue it.

Why is not my pen charged with a love to the Picts, whom I also, equally with the Scots, entitle to this subduing? And is a nation, now no where extant, to be the object of my affection?

But this five-times’ subduing of the south of this island, is in all authors as generally known and received, as that a man hath five fingers on his hand. Wherefore no more in answer to—just nothing.

## BOOK III.

FROM THE TIME OF THE NORMAN CONQUEST, TO THE FIRST  
PREACHING OF WICKLIFFE.

60. DR. HEYLIN.—We are now come unto the times of the Norman government, when the church began to settle on a surer bottom both for power and polity; the bishops less obnoxious to the kings than formerly, because elected by the monks and canons of their own cathedrals; their Consistories free from the intermixture of lay-assistance, and their Synods managed by themselves. Wherein though they had power of making such synodical Constitutions as did *ipso facto* bind all parties, yet our Author is resolved to have it otherwise.

FULLER.—All this is but prefatory, and, therefore, my answer not necessary thereunto. The Animadvertor seemeth to congratulate the condition of the English church, as better hereafter in the following, than in foregoing, ages.

He instanceth in two particulars, POWER and POLITY, omitting a third, (worth both,) PIETY, (to which *purity in doctrine* may be reduced,) which now began more and more to be impaired.

Let me add, that, after the kings of England had parted (which, indeed, was wrested from them) with the investing of bishops, bishops became less manageable by, and dutiful to, their prince, and more insulting over the people; and being “less obnoxious” (to use the Animadvertor’s word) to the sovereign, were more noxious to the subjects. Our author proceeds:—

61, 62. DR. HEYLIN.—“The proceedings,” saith he, “of the canon law were never wholly received into practice in the land; but so as made subject, in whatsoever touched temporals, to secular laws and national customs. And the laity at pleasure limited canons in this behalf.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 290.) How false this is, how contrary to the power and practice of the church before the submission of the clergy to king Henry VIII.; and, finally, how dangerous a ground is hereby laid to weaken the authority of Convocations, will best appear by laying down the sum of a petition presented by the House of Commons to the same king Henry, together with the answer of the prelates and inferior clergy, then being synodically assembled, to the said petition.

The substance of the petition was as followeth: namely,—

“That the clergy of this your realm, being your highness’s subjects, in their Convocation by them holden within this your realm, have made, and daily make, divers sanctions or laws concerning temporal

things, and some of them be repugnant to the laws and statutes of your realm, not having ne requiring your most royal assent to the same laws so by them made, nother any assent or knowledge of your lay subjects is had to the same, nother to them published and known in their mother tongue, albeit divers and sundry of the said laws extend in certain causes to your excellent person, your liberty and prerogative royal, and to the interdiction of your laws and possessions, and so likewise to the goods and possessions of your lay subjects, declaring the infringers of the same laws so by them made, not only to incur the terrible censure of excommunication, but also to the detestable crime and sin of heresie, by the which divers of your humble and obedient lay subjects be brought into this ambiguity, whether they may doe and execute your laws according to your jurisdiction royal of this realm, for dread of the same censures and pains comprised in the same laws so by them made in their Convocations, to the great trouble and inquietation of your said humble and obedient lay subjects, &c., the impeachment of your jurisdiction and prerogative royal."\*

The answer thereunto was this:—

"To this we say, that forasmuch as we repute and take our authority of making laws to be grounded upon the scripture of God, and the determination of holy church, which must also be a rule and squier to try the justice and righteousness of all laws, as well spiritual as temporal; we verily trust, that, considering the laws of this realm be such as have been made by most Christian, religious, and devout princes and people, how both these laws proceeding from one fountain, the same being sincerely interpreted, and after the good meaning of the makers, there shall be found no repugnancy, nor contrariety, but that the one shall be found as aiding, maintaining, and supporting the other. And if it shall otherwise appear, as it is our duty (whereunto we shall alwayes most diligently apply our selves) to reform our ordinances to God's commission, and to conform our statutes and laws, and those of our predecessors, to the determination of scripture and holy church; so we hope in God, and shall daily pray for the same, that your highnesse will, if there appear cause why, with the assent of your people, temper your Grace's laws accordingly. Whereby shall ensue a most happy and perfect conjunction and agreement, as God being *lapis angularis*, to agree and conjoyn the same. And as concerning the requiring of your highnesse royal assent to the authority of such laws as have been by our predecessors, or shall be made by us in such points and articles as we have by God's authority to rule and order by such provisions and laws; we knowing your highness' wisdom, and vertue, and learning, nothing doubt but the same perceiveth how the granting hereunto dependeth not upon our will and liberty. And that we your most humble subjects may not submit the execution of our charge and duty certainly prescribed by God, to your highnesse assent, although in

\* "Acts of Convocation," anno 1532.



very deed the same is most worthy for your most noble, princely, and excellent vertues, not onely to give your royal assent, but also to devise and command what we should for good order and manners by statutes and laws provide in the church; neverthelesse considering we may not so ne in such sort refrain the doing of our office in the feeding and ruling of Christ's people your Grace's subjects; we most humbly desiring your Grace as the same hath heretofore, so from henceforth to shew your Grace's minde and opinion unto us, what your high wisdome shall think convenient, which we shall most gladly hear and follow, if it shall please God to inspire us so to doe, with all submission and humility beseech the same, following the steps of your most noble progenitors, and conformably to your our own acts doe maintain and defend such laws, and ordinances, as we, according to our calling and by authority of God, shall, for his honour, make to the edification of vertue, and maintaining Christ's faith, of which your highnesse is named defender, and hath been hitherto indeed a special protector.

"Furthermore, whereas your said lay subjects say, that sundry of the said laws extend in certain causes to your excellent person, your liberty and prerogative royal, and to the interdiction of your land and possessions: to this your said orators say, that having submitted the tryal and examining of the laws made in the church by us and our predecessors, to the just and straight rule of God's laws, which giveth measure of power, prerogative, and authority to all emperors, kings, princes, and potentates, and all other; we have conceived such opinion, and have such estimation of your majestie's goodnesse and vertue, that whatsoever any persons not so well learned as your Grace is, would pretend unto the same, whereby we your most humble subjects may be brought in your Grace's displeasure and indignation, surmising that we should, by usurpation and presumption, extend our laws to your most noble person, prerogative, and realm, yet the same your highnesse being so highly learned, will of your own most bounteous goodnesse facilly discharge and deliver us from that envy, when it shall appear that the said laws are made by us, or our predecessors, conformable and maintainable by the scripture of God, and determination of the church, against which no laws can stand or take effect."

Somewhat to this purpose had been before endeavoured by the Commons in the last Parliament of king Edward III.; of which, because they got nothing by it, but only the showing of their teeth without hurting anybody, I shall say nothing in this place, reserving it to the time of the Long Parliament, in the reign of king Charles, when this point was more hotly followed, and more powerfully prosecuted, than ever formerly.

What says our author unto this? Finds he here any such matter, as that "the laity at their pleasure could limit the canons of the church?" Or that such canons "in whatsoever touched temporals were subject unto secular laws and national customs?" (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 290.) And hereof I desire the reader to take special notice,

as that which is to serve for a *catholicon*, or “general antidote” against those many venomous insinuations, which he shall meet with up and down in the course of this History. As for the case in which our author grounds this pestilent position, it was the canon made in a synod at Westminster, in the time of Anselm, *anno* 1102, prohibiting “the sale of men and women like brute beasts in the open market:” which canon, not finding presently an universal obedience over all the kingdom, (as certainly ill customs are not easily left, when they are countenanced by profit,) occasioned our author to adventure upon this bold assertion.

FULLER.—I conceived it uncivil to interrupt the Animadvertor in his long discourse until he had ended it; and now profess, I know not how it maketh in opposition to what I said, and heartily wish that the reader may understand it better than I do.

It cannot be denied, but that the clergy did claim and challenge a power, and sometimes *de facto* executed it, over the temporal estates of the laity;—for I behold the clergy more bound (because binding themselves by their representatives) unto their canons;—yet they never peaceably enjoyed their power, as constantly checked and controlled by the laws of the land, in such things wherein the temporal estate, life, and limb of persons were concerned.

We have an eminent instance hereof, in the canon occasioning this discourse. Anselm makes a Constitution, (and that, indeed, charitable and Christian,) “against the sale of men and women like brute beasts in the open market-place.” Now, such persons sold (slaves and vassals, as I understand it) being the goods and chattels of their masters, the proprietaries and owners of their bodies, they would not part with their right in obedience to the canon.

Suppose a Convocation, some thirty years ago, should have made a Canon, without any confirmation from Parliament, “That no merchant living in England should, by his factors, sell any Negroes or Blacks in the Barbadoes,” which formerly he had bought in Guinea; it would not oblige to the observation thereof; because in such matters wherein property was concerned, the Canon must say to the Common Law, “By your leave, Sir.”

I have written nothing in this point, but what I have a good author for. And seeing the Animadvertor in his “Geography” hath been pleased to tell a passage betwixt him and his father’s man,\*

\* On perusing the story to which Fuller here alludes, the reader will be induced to consider Heylin as pleasant a gossip as the man on whom he animadverts for the occasional exercise of the same faculty. This is the style in which the old Geographer himself relates it:—

“In all countries there are many places, which are fortified and made towns of war; or otherwise remarkable for some signal battle, in these late bustles and commotions of the Christian world; of which no notice hath been taken in former times, and, consequently, not within the compass of this discourse: and yet, perhaps, they may grow as

let me relate another, wherein myself was concerned, knowing it to be as true, and hoping it to be as well applied :—

Some three years since, walking on the Lord's-day into the park at Copthall, the third son (a child in coats) of the earl of Dorset, desired to go with me ; whereof I was unwilling, fearing he should straggle from me whilst I meditated on my sermon ; and when I told him, that if he went with me, he would lose himself, he returned, “ Then you must lose yourself first ; for I will go with you.”

This rule I always observe, when meddling with matters of law : because I myself am a child therein, I will ever go with a man in that faculty, such as is most eminent in his profession, *a cujus latere non discedam* ; so that if he lose me, he shall first lose himself, as hereafter, when we grapple together in this controversy, will appear.

As for this particular case, (for I will engage no further for the present,) this Canon did not dispossess masters of their property in their vassals ; and no meaner than Mr. Selden is my conductor herein, styled hereafter by the Animadvertor, “ ὁ περὶ τῶν παιδευμένος, that renowned humanitian and philologer.” \*

Yea, I entered my author in the margin, (had the Animadvertor been pleased to take notice thereof,) *Spicileg. ad Edmerium*, page 208 :—

*Neque sanè canon hic, aut alia apud nos lata lex, id juris hactenus adeò refixit ; quin in jurisconsultorum nostratium commentariis passim legibus quibus utimur consonum agnoscatur :* “ Neither truly this canon, nor any other law made amongst us, hath hitherto unfastened this right ; but that, in the comments (or reports) of our common lawyers, it is acknowledged consonant to those laws which we use.” And though in process of time, first *conscientious* then *all* masters laudably submitted themselves to this canon, forbearing such sales ; yet were they not by the canon divested of the

famous and considerable, in the times to come, as many of the mightier cities now decayed and ruined. He that shall think the work imperfect for some deficiencies of this kind, may be likened to the country-fellow in Aristophanes, who picked a great quarrel with the map, because he could not find where his own farm stood. And such a country-customer I did meet with once, a servant of my elder brother's, sent by him with some horses to Oxon., to bring me and a friend of mine unto his house ; who, having lost his way as we passed through the Forest of Whichwood, and not able to recover any beaten track, did very earnestly entreat me to lead the way till I had brought him past the woods to the open fields : which when I had refused to do, as I had good reason, alleging that I had never been there before, and, therefore, that I could not tell which way to lead him : *That is strange*, said he, *I have heard my old master your father say, that you made A BOOK OF ALL THE WORLD ; and cannot you find your way out of the wood ?* Which, being spoken out of an honest simplicity, not out of any pretence to wit, or the least thought of putting a blunt jest upon me, occasioned a great deal of merriment for a long time.”—EDIT.

\* In his Animadversion on my eighth book, or reign of queen Mary.

power of doing it, such vendition and emption being by the Common Law preserved unto them, though now, very commendably, long disused.

And whereas the clergy, in their answer, pretend all their canons grounded on the word of God, I would fain be informed where they find in the New Testament, (which ought to regulate their proceedings,) that the power of the church extendeth to life, limb, or estate. Sure I am her censures appear spiritual on the soul, by those expressions, "Bind on earth," Matt. xvi. 19; "Cast out," 1 John ix. 34; "Deliver to Satan," 1 Cor. v. 5; &c. But because the reader reserveth a larger prosecution of this point for another time, we will also respite our larger answer thereunto. Our author proceeds:—

63. DR. HEYLIN.—"Indeed, St. David's had been Christian some hundred of years, whilst Canterbury was yet pagan." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 298.) Not many hundred years, I am sure of that; nor yet so many as to make a plural number by the Latin grammar; Kent being conquered by the Saxons, who brought in Paganism, *anno* 455; converted unto Christianity by the preaching of Austin, *anno* 569. Not much more than one hundred and forty years betwixt the one and the other.

FULLER—The Christian antiquity of St. David's bare a double date, one native or inherent, the other adopted and reputative.

1. The *inherent*, from the time that St. David fixed there; on which account, I believe, it was no more than one hundred and forty years senior to Canterbury.

2. The *reputative*, from the first founding of a bishopric at Caerleon by king Lucius, which (indifferently stated) was about the year of our Lord 169; which was four hundred years before Canterbury.

Now, it is notoriously known, that the antiquity of Caerleon, (whence the sec was removed,) in computation of the seniority, is adjoined to St. David's, her adopted daughter.

Hence was it that the abbot of Bangor, in his answer unto Austin,\* acknowledged himself and his convent under the government of the bishop of Caerleon upon Uske, (though then no bishop therein,) meaning St. David's thereby, as Dr. Hammond† and others do unanimously allow.

Thus grafting St. David's (as it ought) on the stock of Caerleon, it is senior in Christianity to Canterbury four hundred years, and *four* may be termed "some," in the strictest propriety of language.

\* A record lately so prized by the Animadvertor.  
Appendix.

† In his account of H. S.'s

64. DR. HEYLIN.—“To whose honour he” (namely, king Stephen) “erected St. Stephen’s chapel in Westminster, near the place where lately the Court of Requests was kept.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 306.) Our author is here mealy-mouthed, and will not *parler le tout*, as the Frenchmen say. For otherwise he might have told us, that this chapel is still standing, and, since the surrendry of it to king Edward VI., hath been used for a Parliament House, employed to that purpose by the Commons, as it still continueth.\* What might induce our author to be thus reserved, I can hardly tell; unless it be to prevent such inferences and observations, which by some wanton wits might be made upon it.

FULLER.—I hope, rather, some gracious hearts will make pious improvement thereupon, praying to God, that, seeing so many signal persons are now assembled therein, the very place, once dedicated as a chapel to St. Stephen, may be their more effectual remembrancer to imitate the purity and piety of that renowned saint; that so God may be invited graciously to be present amongst them, to over-rule all their consultations to his glory, the good of the church and state, and the true honour of the nation. And to this let every good man say, “Amen.” Our author proceeds:—

65. DR. HEYLIN.—“By the same title from his father, Geoffrey Plantagenet, he possessed fair lands in Anjou and Maine.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 322.) I had thought he had possessed somewhat more in Anjou and Maine, than some “fair lands” only; his father Geoffrey Plantagenet being the proprietary Earl of Anjou, Maine, and Turenne, not a titular only; succeeded in the same by this king Henry and his two sons, Richard and John, till lost unhappily by the last, with the rest of our estates on that side of the sea. From this Geoffrey descended fourteen kings of the name of Plantagenet; the name not yet extinguished, though it be impoverished: our author speaking of one of them, who was found not long since at the plough: (Ch. Hist. vol. i. book 2, p. 254:) another of that name publishing a book about the plantation of New-Albion, *anno* 1646, or not long before.

FULLER.—The frequent and familiar figure of *meiosis* will rectify all, whereby less is *said* than *meant*, and therefore *more* must be understood than is *said*. Besides, it made me mince my expression, (being loath to exceed,) because this Geoffrey did not to me appear (though the earl) so entire in those dominions, but that the kings of France and England had cities and castles interposed therein. Our author proceeds:—

66. DR. HEYLIN.—“King John sent a base, degenerate, and unchristian embassy to Admiralius Murmelius, a Mahometan king of Morocco, then very puissant, and possessing a great part of Spain.”

\* Stow’s “Survey,” p. 893.

(Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 342.) This Admiralius Marmelius, as our author and the old monks call him, was by his own name called Mahomet Enaser, the Miramomoline of Morocco; to whom, if king John sent any such message, it was as “base, unchristian, and degenerate” as our author makes it.

FULLER.—I will ingenuously confess, that the first time I found this story was in the doctor’s “Microcosm;” the novelty making me take the more notice thereof. Though since I have met with it in M. Paris, (the fountain,) and other authors, (the channels thereof,) I conceive it was as lawful for me to relate it, as for the Animadvertor, who epithets this embassy “base, degenerate, and unchristian;”\* the words which in me he reproveth.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, being the credit of the tale depends upon the credit of the monkish authors, to which brood of men that king was known to be a professed enemy, (hating and hated by one another,) it is not to be esteemed so highly as a piece of Apocrypha, and much less to be held for Gospel.

FULLER.—Here he rather speaks *aliter* than *alia*, from what I had written on the same subject, who thus concluded the character of king John:—

“We only behold him through such a light as the friars his foes show him in; who so hold the candle, that, with the shadow thereof, they darken his virtues, and present only his vices. Yea, and as if they had also poisoned his memory, they cause his faults to swell to a prodigious greatness, making him with their pens more black in conditions than the Morocco king (whose aid he requested) could be in complexion.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 344.)

Here I desire to give the reader a taste of what doth frequently occur in this book, and of what I justly did complain; namely, the Animadvertor,† “sometimes not liking my language, (as not proper and expressive enough,) substituteth his own, with little or no variation of matter.”

I confess he is not bound to use my words, and such variation, simply in itself, is no wrong unto me; but it becometh an injury when they must pass for “Necessary Animadversions” on my book, to the defaming thereof, as if it were defective without them, which were there (though perchance not so finely) as fully and clearly before.

DR. HEYLIN.—Possible it is, that, being overlaid by his own subjects, and distressed by the French, he might send unto that king for aid in his great extremities. And, doing this, (if this were all,) he did no

\* His description of Barbary, [in his “Cosmography,” p. 958.]  
part i. chap. ii. p. 297.

† *Vide supra*,

more than nature, and indignation, and the necessity of his affairs did provoke him to ; not half so much as was done afterwards, upon far weaker grounds, by king Francis I. employing the Turk's forces both by sea and land against Charles V. But the monks, coming to the knowledge of this secret practice, and construeing his actions to the worst, improved the molehill to a mountain, rendering him thereby as odious to posterity as he was to themselves.

FULLER.—How much is this different from what I have written before, but that the Animadvertor will not wear words at the second-hand of my using, but will have them spick and span new of his own making? Our author proceeds :—

67. DR. HEYLIN.—“ I question whether the bishop of Rochester, whose country house at Bromley is so nigh, had ever a house in the city.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 355.) There is no question but he had, Stow finding it in Southwark by the name of Rochester-house, adjoining on the south side to the bishop of Winchester's ; ruinous and out of reparation in his time, (as possibly not much frequented since the building of Bromley-house,) and since converted into tenements for private persons.

FULLER.—It was a question to me, though none to the Animadvertor ; now it is a question neither to him nor to me, who by him am informed. I see that men may learn by what boys learn in their QUI MIHI :—

*Sed qui nil dubitat, nil capit inde boni.*

Had I not questioned this once publicly, probably I had questioned it ever privately, and gone in myself without satisfaction.

68. DR. HEYLIN.—But since our author hath desired “ others to recover the rest from oblivion,” I shall help him to the knowledge of two more, and shall thank any man to find out the third. The first of these two is the bishop of Lincoln's house, situate near the old Temple in Holborn, first built by Robert de Chesney, Bishop of Lincoln, *anno* 1147, since aliened from that see to the earls of Southampton, and passing by the name of Southampton-house. The second is the bishop of Bangor's, a fair house situate in Shoe-lane, near St. Andrew's church, of late time leased out by the bishops, and, not long since, the dwelling of Dr. Smith, Doctor in Physic, a right honest and ingenuous person, and my very good friend. Of all the old bishops which were founded before king Harry VIII. there is none whose house we have not found but the bishop of Asaph ; to the finding whereof, if our author, or any other, will hold forth the candle, I shall follow the light the best I can, and be thankful for it.

FULLER.—I faithfully promise so to do, as soon as I arrive at any good intelligence thereof. Our author proceeds :—



69. DR. HEYLIN.—“And though some high Royalists look on it as the product of subjects’ animosities, improving themselves on their princes’ extremities,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 362.) Our author tells us in his “Epistle to the Reader,” that “the three first books of this volume were, for the main, written in the reign of the late king,” and that it would “appear so by some passages which were then proper for the government.” But, certainly, if these words were written in the time of the late king, they were written in the time of his distress, when his affairs were desperate and his party ruined; the name of “Royalists” had not else been used here in the way of reproach, nor any new matter charged upon them, which might render them more obnoxious to fine and ransom than the crime of loyalty.

FULLER.—My loyalty did rise and fall with his majesty’s success, as a rock in the sea doth with the ebbing and flowing of the tide. I had *more pity*, but *not less honour*, for him in his deepest distress.

God knows my heart, I use not the word “high Royalist” here as by way of reproach, and the impartial reader neither will nor can so understand it.

Some there are who maintain, that a king is no way confined with his own laws, but that, without any fault, he may, by his own list, limit his demands on his subjects, taking from them, without any wrong, what they refuse to pay unto him. These the Animadvertor will call “Royalists,” and I dare call them “high Royalists;” beholding (as I have said) the Grand Charter “as the product of subjects’ animosities, improving themselves on their princes’ extremities.”

DR. HEYLIN.—But, whatsoever our author thinks, it cannot but appear to any who consults the story of former times, that the original of this Charter was first writ in blood, obtained by working on the necessities of some princes, extorted in the minority of another, and finally confirmed by him who had not power to justify his denial of it.

FULLER.—I could heartily have wished, that the Animadvertor had expressed the names of these kings; who now only hope that I conjecture them aright.

1. King John, on the working of whose necessities it was first obtained.

2. Henry III. whose consent thereto was extorted in his minority.

3. Edward I. confirming it when not in power to justify his denial, during his durance as a prisoner taken in battle.

Here, I confess, are three sad conditions, *necessity* of the first, *minority* of the second, *captivity* of the third. But know, that the last of these—when at liberty, and not only endued with freedom, but empowered with force, and being as wise and successful a

prince as ever sat on the English throne—found it advantageous for his interest to observe what formerly when a prisoner he had confirmed.

Otherwise his sword was so long, (reaching as far as Palestine itself,) and so sharp, (hewing his conquering way through Wales and Scotland,) that therewith (enforced with his arm) he might have rescinded the seals of the Grand Charter, and put himself into the condition of an absolute command.

But he preferred the strict observation thereof, partly out of piety, because solemnly sworn thereunto ; partly out of policy, as sensible that therein the rights of sovereigns and subjects were indifferently contempered, to their mutual happiness ; it being fetters to neither, but girdles to both, to be strengthened by such restraints.

70. DR. HEYLIN.—And if our author be so certain, that “those kings flourished most both at home and abroad, who tied themselves most conscientiously to the observation thereof ;” I would fain know how some of our kings, who have “most conscientiously tied themselves to that observation,” became so unprosperous ; or how some others came to “flourish both at home and abroad,” who have made it their great work to infringe the same in almost all the principal articles and main branches of it.

FULLER.—It is an hard question, and yet perchance more dangerous than difficult to answer ; but the reason I dare allege is this : “Even so, Father, because it pleased thee.”

Let me add, that such conscientious observers thereof, who have proved unsuccessful, may esteem their losses as sweet-brier and holy-thistle, and more cordially comfort themselves in such sanctified afflictions, than the infringers of their charter could content themselves in their successful oppression.

I cannot part from this point till I have inserted, that sir Robert Cotton—one who had in him as much of the gentleman, antiquary, lawyer, good subject, and good patriot, as any in England—was the author, (in his “Short View of the long Reign of King Henry the third,”) who made the observation of those most successful kings, by whom the Grand Charter was most conscientiously observed. Our author proceeds :—

71. DR. HEYLIN.—“The poor Jews durst not go into France, whence lately they had been solemnly banished ; but generally disposed themselves in Germany and Italy.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 390.) The “poor Jews” are more beholding to our author for his commiseration than the “high Royalists” (as he calls them) in the former passage. But, *poor* or *rich*, they might have passed safely into France, had they been so minded. For though he tells us, that they had been

solemnly banished out of France before this time; yet either such banishment was repealed or temporary only, or, as I rather think, not so much as sentenced. Certain I am, our learned Brerewood, upon a diligent *inquiry*, hath found it otherwise than our author doth; letting us know, that "the first country in Christendom whence the Jews were expelled without hope of return, was our country of England, whence they were banished, *anno* 1290, by king Edward I.; and not long after out of France, *anno* 1307, by Philippus Pulcher."\* Not out of France first, out of England afterwards, as our author would have it.

FULLER.—I wonder any good Christians would be offended with me for pitying them by the name of "poor Jews." If any high Royalists (as I fear there is too many) be in low estate, would it were as well in my power to relieve as to pity them! Till when, they shall have my prayers, that God would give them patience, and support them in their deepest distress.

The author will find, that though the great, general, and final banishment of the Jews out of France was *anno* 1307, under Philip the Fair, yet formerly there had been edicts for their exile thence.

72. DR. HEYLIN.—"Thus men of yesterday have pride too much to remember what they were the day before." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 405.) An observation true enough, but not well applied. The two Spencers whom he speaks this of, were not "men of yesterday," or raised out of the dirt or dunghill to so great an height; but of as old and known nobility as the best in England: insomuch that when a question grew in Parliament, whether the baroness De Spencer or the Lord of Abergavenny were to have precedence, it was adjudged unto De Spencer, thereby declared the ancientest barony of the kingdom at that time then being. † These two Spencers,—Hugh the father was created earl of Winchester for term of life; and Hugh the son, by marrying one of the daughters and co-heirs of Gilbert de Clare, became earl of Gloucester;—men more to be commended for their loyalty, than accused for their pride, but that the king was now declining, and, therefore, it was held fit by the prevalent faction to take his two supporters from him, as they after did.

FULLER.—The two Spencers fall under a double consideration, and are beheld in history for their extraction, either as absolutely in themselves, or as comparatively with others.

*Absolutely*, they were of honourable parentage; and I believe the elder might be born a baron, whose barony (by the heir-general) is still extant in Mildmay Fane, earl of Westmoreland; and from the younger house of a male-heir, the lord Spencer of Wormelayton (now earl of Sunderland) doth, as I have seen in his pedigree, derive himself.

\* BREREWOOD'S "Inquiry," cap. 13.

† CAMDEN in Monmouthshire.

*Comparatively*, so were they far inferior to most of those great persons over whom they insulted, being originally earls, and some of them of royal extraction.

Again, the two Spencers may and ought by an historian to be considered, 1. As to be commended for their loyalty, and, 2. As to be condemned for their insolency.

On the first account, they deserve just praise ; and it is probable enough, that they find the less favour from some pens, for being so faithful to so unfortunate a sovereign.

The latter cannot be excused, appearing too plain in all our Histories. Our author proceeds :—

73. DR. HEYLIN.—“The Lord Chancellor was ever a bishop.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 422.) If our author by this word *ever* understands ἐπὶ τὸ πᾶν, “most commonly,” or “for the most part,” he is right enough ; but then it will not stand with the following words ; namely, “as if it had been against equity to employ any other therein.” And, on the other side, if he take the word *ever* in its proper and more natural sense, as if none but bishops had ever been advanced unto that office, he doth not only misinform the reader, but confute himself, he having told us, in page 311 of this present book, [of his Church-History,] that Thomas Becket, being then but archdeacon of Canterbury, was made Lord Chancellor, and that, as soon he was made archbishop, he resigned that office. But the truth is, that not only men in holy orders, but many of the laity also, had attained that dignity ; as will appear to any who will take the pains to consult the catalogue of the Chancellors and Keepers of the Great Seal, in the “Glossary” of sir Henry Spelman : in which appear not only some of inferior dignity, as deans, archdeacons, household chaplains ; but many also not dignified with any ecclesiastical title or notification, and, therefore, in all probability to be looked on as mere laymen, counsellors, and servants to the kings in whose times they lived, or otherwise studied in the laws, and of good affections, and consequently capable of the place of such trust and power.

FULLER.—May the reader take notice, that this complaint was made by the Commons in the 11th of Edward III. *anno* 1336. Now, “ever” I here restrain to the oldest man alive, then present in Parliament, who could not distinctly remember the contrary, from the first of king Edward I. who began his reign 1272 ; so that for full sixty-four years, an uninterrupted series of bishops (except possibly one put in, *pro tempore*, for a month or two) possessed the place of Chancellors.

This complaint of the Commons occasioned that the king, some three years after, (namely, in the fifteenth year of his reign,) conferred the Chancellor’s place on a layman. But it was not long

before things returned to the old channel of clergymen, and so generally for many years continued, with some few and short interpositions of laymen. Our author proceeds :—

DR. HEYLIN.—“This year, namely, 1350, authors generally agree, king Edward instituted the Order of the Garter.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 426.) Right enough as unto the time, but much mistaken in some things which relate unto that ancient and most noble Order; our author taking up his commodities at the second-hand, neither consulting the records, nor dealing in this business with men of credit.

FULLER.—I am now come under the roof of the Animadvertor, who, by the laws of hospitality, is bound to treat me the more courteously; I mean, I am entered into a subject wherein he is well seen, and therefore might favourably connive at my small slips, being therein best studied.

It is *severely* said, “that in this business I dealt with no men of credit!” The highest person, (next the son of the king,) wearing a blue ribbon, was pleased so far to favour me, as that from his own mouth I wrote the last sheet of my History, his Grace endeavouring to be very exact in all particulars.

74. DR. HEYLIN.—For, First, there are not fourteen Canons resident in the church of Windsor, but thirteen only with the dean; it being king Edward's purpose when he founded that Order, consisting of twenty-six knights, himself being one, to institute as many greater and lesser Canons, and as many old soldiers (commonly called Poor Knights) to be pensioned there: though, in this last, the number was not made up to his first intention.

FULLER.—The mistake (such an one as it is) shall be amended in my next edition.

75. DR. HEYLIN.—He tells us, Secondly, that if he “be not mistaken,” (as indeed he is,) “Sir Thomas Roe was the last Chancellor of the Order.” Whereas Sir James Palmer, one of the Gentlemen Huishers [Ushers] of the Privy Chamber, succeeded him in the place of Chancellor after his decease, *anno* 1644.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor is very discourteous to deny me the benefit of the parenthesis, “If I be not mistaken.” The best authors have their *Ni fallor, Si quid video, Si benè intelligo*, and the like: these are grains allowed to all pieces current in payment.

Sir Thomas Roe was the last Chancellor who effectually officiated in his place; Windsor, before the year 1644, being a chief garrison of the Parliament.

Tully calls a consul, chosen in the morning and put out before night, “a *vigilant* consul, who never slept in all his consulship.”

But, on another occasion, one may say of sir James Palmer, (otherwise a worthy gentleman, well deserving that and a better place,) that he was “a very watchful Chancellor, who never slept in Windsor whilst invested in his office.”

76. DR. HEYLIN.—He tells us, Thirdly, that there belongs unto it one “Register, being always the dean of Windsor :” which is nothing so. For though the deans of late times have been Registers also, yet *ab initio non fuit sic*, “it was not so from the beginning ;” the first dean was also Register, being John Boxul, *anno* 1557. Before which time, beginning at the year 1414, there had been nine Registers, who were not deans ; but how many more before that time, I am not able to say, their names not being on record.

FULLER.—I say not, that the Register always *was* the dean, but *being* always the dean ; which, relating to our and our fathers’ memories, is right enough : but it shall be reformed.

77, 78. DR. HEYLIN.—And, Fourthly, he tells us, that the garter is one of the extraordinary habiliments of the Knights of this Order, their ordinary being only “the blue ribbon about their necks, with the picture of St. George appendent, and the sun in his glory on the left shoulder of their cloak ;” whereas, indeed, the garter is of common wearing, and of such necessary use that the Knights are not to be seen abroad without it, “upon pain of paying two crowns to any officer of the Order, who shall first claim it, unless they be to take a journey,” \* in which case “it is sufficient to wear a blue ribbon under their boots to denote the garter.” Lastly. Whereas our author tells us, that the Knights hereof do wear “on the left shoulder of their cloaks a sun in his glory,” and attributes this wearing, as some say, to king Charles, I will, first, put him out of doubt, that this addition was king Charles’s ; then, show him his mistake in the matter itself. And, First, in the first year of that king, April 26th, 1626, it was thus enacted at a public Chapter of the Order, namely, “That all Knights and Companions of the Order shall wear upon the left part of their cloaks, coats, and riding cassocks at all times when they shall not wear their robes, and in all places of assembly, an escutcheon of the arms of St. George, *id est*, a cross within a garter, not enriched with pearls or stones ; in token of the honour which they hold from the same most noble Order, instituted and ordained for persons of the highest worth and honour.” Our author, Secondly, may perceive by this Act of the king’s, that St. George’s cross within the garter is the main device enjoined to be worn by all the Knights of that noble Order ; to which the adding of “the sun in his glory” served but for ornament and embellishing, and might be either used or not used, (but only for conformity’s sake,) as they would themselves.

\* “History of St. George,” lib. iii. cap. 3, 8.

FULLER.—This “sun in glory” affords me small light, so that I can see but very little (if any thing at all) which I have to alter.

DR. HEYLIN.—So many errors in so few lines one shall hardly meet with.

FULLER.—Yea, with more in fewer lines, even in the Animadvertor himself, in laying down the root and branches of the noble family of the Montagues; mistakes the more remarkable, because done in correction of Mr. Sanderson, and making more faults than he mendeth; or, rather, all is but one mistake, resulting from a continued complication of omissions, confusions, and transpositions.

“Fol. 490. *Sir Edward Montague had three sons, Edward, the eldest, Knight of the Bath, &c.*—The author here is much mistaken in the house of the Montagues.

“For, First, that Edward Montague who was Knight of the Bath, &c., was not brother to James Bishop of Winchester, and Henry Earl of Manchester, but their brother’s son, that is to say, the son of another Edward their eldest brother.

“Secondly. Besides that Edward, James, and Henry, there was another brother whom the author names not, though he could not choose but know the man, namely, Sir Sidney Montague, one of the Masters of the Requests to the late king Charles. Therefore, to set this matter right, I am to let both him and his readers know, that Sir Edward Montague, Chief Justice in the time of king Edward VI. was father of another Edward, who lived peaceably and nobly in his own country. To whom succeeded a third Edward, who fought for honour in the wars, and gained the reputation of a good commander; the elder brother of James, Henry, and Sidney, before-mentioned, and the father of a fourth Edward who was made Knight of the Bath, at the coronation of king James, *anno* 1603, and afterwards created lord Montague of Boughton in the nineteenth year of that king, *anno* 1621, which honourable title is now enjoyed by his son, (another Edward,) *anno* 1658.


“And, Thirdly, though I grant that Dr. James Montague, bishop of Winchester, (the second brother of the four,) was of great power and favour in the time of king James,” &c.—HEYLIN’S “Advertisements on *the History of the Reign of King James*,” pages 21, 22.

Thus far Dr. Heylin, out of his “Advertisements,” written in correction of Mr. Sanderson’s “History of the Reign of King James.”

To rectify this heap of errors, not to be paralleled in any author, (pretending to the emendation of another,) I have here plainly set



down the male pedigree of this noble, numerous, and successful family.



I presume, the Animadvertor will allow me exact in this family, which hath reflected so favourably upon me, that I desire (and indeed, deserve) to live no longer, than whilst I acknowledge the same.

## BOOK IV.

FROM THE FIRST PREACHING OF WICKLIFFE, TO THE  
BEGINNING OF THE REIGN OF KING HENRY VIII.

79—81. DR. HEYLIN.—Our author begins this book with the story of Wickliffe, and continueth it in relating the successes of him and his followers; to which he seems so much addicted, as to christen their opinions by the name of “the Gospel.” For, speaking of such encouragements and helps as were given to Wickliffe by the duke of Lancaster, with other advantages, which the conditions of those times did afford unto him, he addeth, that “we must attribute the main to Divine Providence blessing the Gospel.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 438.) A name too high to be bestowed upon the fancies of a private man, many of whose opinions were so far from truth, so contrary to peace and civil order, so inconsistent with the government of the church of Christ, as make them utterly unworthy to be looked on as a part of the Gospel. Or if the doctrines of Wickliffe must be called “the Gospel,” what shall become of the religion then established in the realm of England, and in most other parts of the western world? Were all but Wickliffe’s followers relapsed to Heathenism? Were they turned Jews, or had embraced the law of Mahomet? If none of these, and that they still continued in the faith of Christ, delivered to them in the Gospels of the four Evangelists and other apostolical writers, Wickliffe’s new doctrines could not challenge the name of “Gospel,” nor ought it to be given to him by the pen of any. But such is the humour of some men, as to call every separation from the church of Rome by the name of “Gospel;” the greater the separation is, the more pure the Gospel. No name but that of *Evangelici* would content the Germans when they first separated from that church, and reformed their own: and Harry Nichols, when he separated from the German churches, and became the father of the Familists, bestows the name of *Evangelium Regni* on his dreams and dotages. Gospels of this kind we have had, and may have too many, *quot capita tot fides*, “as many gospels, in a manner, as sects and sectaries,” if this world go on.

Now as Wickliffe’s doctrines are advanced to the name of Gospel, so his followers (whatsoever they were) must be called God’s servants, the bishops being said to be “busy in persecuting God’s servants;” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 468;) and for what crime soever they were brought to punishment, it must be thought they suffered only for the Gospel and the service of God. A pregnant evidence whereof we have in the story of sir John Oldcastle, accused in the time of king Harry V. for a design to kill the king and his brethren, actually in arms against that king at the head of twenty thousand men, attainted

for the same in open Parliament, and condemned to die, and executed in St. Giles's-Fields accordingly, as both sir Roger Acton, his principal counsellor, and thirty-seven of his accomplices, had been before.\* For this we have not only the authority of our common chronicles, Walsingham, Stow, and many others; but the records of the Tower, and Acts of Parliament, as is confessed by our author. (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 488.) Yet, coming out of Wickliffe's schools, and the chief scholar questionless which was trained up in them, he must be registered for a martyr in Fox's Calendar. And though our author dares not quit him, (as he says himself,) yet such is his tenderness and respect to Wickliffe's Gospel, that he "is loath to load his memory with causeless crimes," (*ibid.*) taxeth the clergy of that time for their hatred to him, discrediteth the relation of T. Walsingham, and all later authors, who are affirmed to "follow him, as the flock their bell-wether;" and finally leaves it as a special verdict "to the last day of the revelation of the righteous judgments of God."

FULLER.—First. I fain would know, whether the Animadvertor would be contented with the condition of the church of England, as Wickliffe found it, for opinions and practice; and doth not earnestly desire a reformation thereof?

I am charitably confident, that he doth desire such an emendation; and, therefore, being both of us agreed in this point of the convenience (yea, necessity) thereof, in the Second place I would as fain be satisfied from the Animadvertor, whether he conceived it possible, that such reformation could be advanced (without miracle) all on a sudden, so that many gross errors would not continue, and some new one be superadded?

The man in the Gospel first saw men walking as trees, before he saw perfectly. Nature hath appointed the twilight as a bridge to pass us out of night into day. Such false and wild opinions (like the scales, which fell down from the eyes of St. Paul, when perfectly restored to his sight, Acts ix. 18) have either vanished, or been banished, out of all Protestant Confessions.

Far be it from me to account the rest of England relapsed into Atheism, or lapsed in Judaism, Turcism, &c., whom I behold as "erroneous Christians in doctrine and practice;" and yet still in such a condition, that, though so living and dying, "if they lead a good life, and being weak, ignorant, and seduced, seriously repented of all their sins of ignorance, they might be saved;" closing fully with the moderate judgment of learned Hooker herein.

I know that the very worst of heretics have assumed to themselves the very best of names, gilding themselves over with the title of "Gospellers," and the like; but because thieves often pretend

\* Stow in Hen. V.

themselves honest men, may not honest men avow themselves to be so, and also be so termed by others ?

The words of the Animadvertor of Wickliffe's Gospel might well have been spared, seeing indeed it was Christ's Gospel, (dawning is part of day,) preached by Wickliffe, in a purer manner than in that age, (thanks to God it was then so good !) impurer than in our age : thanks be to God it now is better !

As for sir John Oldcastle, lord Cobham, his case is so perplexed with contrary relations, much may be said against him, and little less in his behalf ; and I have cause to believe indeed, that his innocence wanted not *clearness* but *clearing*.

Whereas the Animadvertor takes exception at my referring the decision hereof "to the revelation of the righteous judgment of God," it must be either because, 1. That time will come too soon—2. Or else come too late—3. Or else be insufficient—to decide the controversy. And having no just cause to suspect any of these, it had been better if my (or rather St. Paul's, Rom. ii. 5) words had passed without his reprehension.

82. DR. HEYLIN.—From the scholar pass we to the master, of whom it is reported in a late popish pamphlet, that he made a recantation of his errors, and lived and died conformable to the church of Rome. This I behold as a notorious falsehood, an imposture of the Romish party, though the argument used by our author be not of strength sufficient to enforce me to it. "*If*," saith he, "*Wickliffe was sufficiently reconciled to the Roman faith*, why was not Rome sufficiently reconciled to him ? using such cruelty to him many years after his death." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 494.) But this, say I, is no reason, of no force at all. Wickliffe might possibly be reconciled to the church of Rome ; and yet the ministers of that church, to strike a terror into others, might execute that vengeance on him, after his decease, which they had neither power nor opportunity to do when he was alive. *Quam vivo iracundiam debuerant, in corpus mortui contulerunt*. And hereof we have a fair example in Marcus Antonius de Dominis, archbishop of Spalato ; who, coming into England, 1616, did manifestly oppose the doctrines of the church of Rome in some learned volumes. But being cunningly wrought on by some emissaries of the Romish party in the year 1622, he went back to Rome, was reconciled to that church, and writ there most reproachfully of the church of England ; which notwithstanding, he was kept prisoner all the rest of his life, and his body burnt to ashes after his decease. So then it is no such new matter for a dissenting Christian, such as Wickliffe and De Dominis were, though branded by the name of "heretics," to be admitted to a reconciliation with the church of Rome, and yet that church to carry a revengeful mind towards them when occasion serves.

FULLER.—I answer, First : I am not the first who have discovered strong affections, with a weak judgment, endeavouring to prove a truth with a non-cogent and un-concluding argument, in case my reason should be disproved.

Secondly. Spalato is no proper parallel of Wickliffe, in this point. Spalato contracted a new guilt, by bragging at the table of a cardinal in Rome, that his book *De Repub. Eccles.* could be answered by none but himself ; \* and *dum calebat* “ whilst the scent hereof was hot,” they burnt his body when but lately dead : whereas their despite followed Wickliffe at a distance more than forty years after his death, on no pretended new misdemeanour.

Lastly. The Animadvertor cometh up unto me, in allowing Wickliffe’s reconciliation to Rome, “ a notorious untruth ; ” and therefore we may proceed to what is more material, wherein we two shall appear two ; being, it seems, but *one* in this difference.

83. DR. HEYLIN.—And all this while we have expected, that our author would have given us a brief summary of Wickliffe’s doctrines, that, by seeing the piety and orthodoxy of his opinions, we might have thought more reverently both of him and his followers. But therein our expectation must remain unsatisfied ; our author thinking it more agreeable to his design to hold the reader in suspense, and conceal this from him : dealing herein as the old Germans did with those of other nations, who came to wait upon Valeda, a great queen amongst them ; “ not suffering any to have a sight of her, to keep them in a greater admiration of her parts and person : ” *arcebantur aspectu quò plus venerationis inesset*, as it is in Tacitus.† The wheat of Wickliffe was so foul, so full of chaff, and intermingled with so many and such dangerous tares, that to expose it to the view were to mar the market. And therefore our author, having formerly honoured his opinions by the name of “ Gospel,” and his followers with the title of “ God’s servants,” as before was noted, had reason not to show them all at once, in a lump together, that we might think them better and more orthodox than indeed they were. But the best is, (to save us the trouble of consulting Harpsfield, and others who have written of them,) our author hath given them us at last on another occasion ; (Ch. Hist. book v. vol. ii. p. 70 ;) many of which the reader may peruse in these Animadversions. (Number 113.) Thus, having laid together so much of this present book as relates to Wickliffe and his followers, I must behold the rest in fragments, as they lie before me.

FULLER.—Wickliffe’s doctrines, so called, fall under a double notion, being either such as were, 1. Charged on him, 2. Maintained by him.

\* Out of exact intelligence sent from his near kindred to Venice, and thence to Mr. Calendrine, now minister of the Dutch church.

† *Historia*, lib. iv.

1. For the former, no fault of omission can be found in me, having given-in (in a full sheet\*) a catalogue of them, digested under several heads, as concerning the pope, prelates, priests, saints, king, Christ, God, with the tome, book, article, chapter, where they are to be found in T. Waldensis.

Sure I am, they were not so bad in all particulars as he there representeth them. If the Animadvertor, a Protestant, living with me in the same suffering age, accuse me for accounting “murdering of kings for necessary prudence, as oft as they shall fall into the power of their subjects;”† which I abhor in my heart, and no such thing appears in the place cited; no wonder if Waldensis charged on Wickliffe abominable errors, which he cordially detested.

2. As for the doctrines which Wickliffe did maintain, we have some, but want an *exact* list of them; and I believe it is past the power of any author alive to present it entire, defecated from the calumniations of his adversaries; and therefore impossibilities are not to be expected from me.

Yet am I not such an admirer of Wickliffe, but that I believe he did defend some gross errors; and it had been no wonder if it were, but had been a miracle if it had not been so, considering the frailty of flesh, darkness of the age he lived in, and difficulty of the subject he undertook. But because the Animadvertor refers to something following in my fifth book, I will also reserve myself for his encounter in time and place appointed. Our author proceeds:—

84. DR. HEYLIN.—“He lies buried in the south aisle of St. Peter’s, Westminster, and since hath got the company of Spencer and Drayton.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 469.) Not Drayton’s company, I am sure; whose body was not buried in the south aisle of that church, but under the north wall thereof in the main body of it, not far from a little door which openeth into one of the prebends’ houses. This I can say on certain knowledge, being casually invited to his funeral, when I thought not of it; though, since, his *statua* hath been set up in the other place which our author speaks of.

FULLER.—I follow the information in his epitaph on his tomb, near the south door in Westminster abbey:—

“Do, pious marble, let the readers know  
What they and what their children owe  
To Drayton’s name; whose sacred dust  
We recommend unto thy trust.

\* Church History, book iv. vol. i. pp. 441—445.  
of this volume.

† In his Introduction, page 336

Preserve his memory, and protect his story,  
 Remain a lasting monument of his glory.  
 And when thy ruin shall disclaim  
 To be the treasurer of his name,  
 His name, which cannot die, shall be  
 An everlasting monument to thee."

Have stones learned to lie, and abuse posterity? Must there needs be a fiction in the epitaph of a poet? If this be a mere cenotaph, that marble hath nothing to do with Drayton's dust. But let us proceed:—

85. DR. HEYLIN.—“The right to the crown lay not in this Henry, but in Edmund Mortimer, earl of March, descended, by his mother, Philippa, from Lionel, duke of Clarence, elder son to Edward III.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 471.) I shall not now dispute the title of the House of Lancaster, though I think it no hard matter to defend it.

FULLER.—I think it is not only difficult, but impossible, except the Animadvertor can challenge the privilege of the patriarch Jacob, to cross his hands, and prefer the younger before the elder child, in succession. (Gen. xlviii. 14.)

Again: the title of Lancaster may be considered, either, 1. As it was when Henry IV. first found it. 2. As it was when Henry VI. last left it.

The latter of these was countenanced with many laws corroborated with three descents, and almost threescore years' possession.

Know, reader, my words are of the right, where it was when Henry IV. first seized the crown; and then he had not a rag of right to cover his usurpation. Instead of justifying whereof, let us admire God's *free pleasure*, in permitting the house of Lancaster to last so long; his *justice*, in assisting York afterwards to recover their right; and his *mercy* at last, in uniting them both, for the happiness of our nation.

DR. HEYLIN.—And much less shall I venture on the other controversy; namely, whether a king may legally be deposed? as is insinuated by our author in the words foregoing.

FULLER.—It seems the Animadvertor finds little in my book above ground for his purpose to cavil at, because fain to mine for my insinuations. But let the reader judge, whether any man alive can from those my words, “The right lay not in this Henry, but in Mortimer, earl of March,” infer an insinuation, that *kings may legally be deposed*. This insinuation must be *in sinu*, “in the bosom” of the Animadvertor, which never was in the breast of the author. More perspicacity must be in the organ, than perspicuity in the object, to perceive such an insinuation.



DR. HEYLIN.—But I dare grapple with him in a point of heraldry, though I find him better studied in it than in matter of history. And certainly our author is here out, in his own dear element; Edmund Mortimer, earl of March, not being the son, but husband, of the lady Philippa, daughter of Lionel, duke of Clarence, and mother of Roger Mortimer, earl of March, whom Richard II. (to despite the house of Lancaster) declared heir-apparent to the kingdom of England.\* It is true, this Edmund was the son of another Philippa, that is to say, of Philippa Montacute, wife of a former Roger, earl of March, one of the founders of the Garter. So that, in whomsoever the best title lay, it lay not in this Edmund Mortimer, as our author makes it.

FULLER.—It is a mere casual slip of my pen, Edmund for Roger; and this is the first time I crave the benefit of this plea in my defence. Our author proceeds:—

86. DR. HEYLIN.—“This is one of the clearest distinguishing characters betwixt the temporal and spiritual lords,—that the former are to be tried *per pares*, ‘by their peers,’ being barons of the realm.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 472.) Nor shall I here dispute the point, whether a bishop may not challenge to be tried by his peers, but whether the bishops were not barons and peers of the realm. Our author intimates that they were not, but I think they were.

FULLER.—From a late insinuation, the Animadvertor now proceeds to a new intimation of mine, utterly unextractable from my words. But know, it never came into my mind to think that bishops were not peers, who to my power will defend it against any who shall oppose it.

DR. HEYLIN.—And this I think on the authority of the learned Selden; in whom we find, that, at a Parliament at Northampton under Henry II. the bishops thus challenge their own peerage; namely: *Non sedemus hîc episcopi, sed barones; nos barones, vos barones; pares hîc sumus*: that is to say, “We sit not here as bishops only, but as barons; we are barons, and you are barons; here we sit as peers.” † Which last is also verified *in terminis*, by the words of a Statute or Act of Parliament, wherein the bishops are acknowledged to be peers of the land. ‡ And, for further proof hereof, John Stratford, Archbishop of Canterbury, (if I remember it aright,) being fallen into the displeasure of king Edward III., and denied entrance into the House of Peers, made his protest, that he was *primus par regni*, “the first peer of the realm,” and therefore not to be excluded from his place and suffrage. §

FULLER.—This indeed is one of the most ancient and pregnant evidences of our bishops sitting as peers in Parliament. But I

\* CAMDEN in Radnor, 624.

† SELDEN’S “Titles of Honour,” part ii. c. v.

‡ Stat. 25 Edward III.

§ Antiquit. Britan. in Stratf.

suspect it may be misimproved by the back-friends to bishops, that they sat there only in the capacity of peers, and not a third estate.

DR. HEYLIN.—But of this argument enough, if not too much, as the case now stands; it being an unhappy thing, to consider what they have been formerly, and what they are at this present.

FULLER.—It is a sad truth which the Animadvertor saith. And here I cannot but remember David's expression, when flying from Absalom: "If I shall find favour in the eyes of the Lord, he will bring me again; but if he say, I have no delight in thee, behold, here I am," &c. 2 Sam. xv. 25. If it be consistent with the goodwill and pleasure of God, in due time he will buoy up again the sunk credit of the clergy; if not, all must submit to Him whose ways are often above reason, never against right. Our author proceeds:—

87. DR. HEYLIN.—"Yea, this very statute, which gave power to a bishop in his diocess to condemn an heretic, plainly proveth, that the king, by consent of Parliament, directed the proceedings of the ecclesiastical court in cases of heresy." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 474.) The bishops and clergy, in their Convocations, had anciently the power of declaring heresy; the bishops singly, in their Consistories, to proceed against them, by enjoining penance and recantation, or otherwise to subject them to excommunication. The statute which our author speaks of, being 2 Hen. IV. cap. 15, proceedeth further; and ordained, in favour of the church, that the ordinary might not only convent, but imprison, the party suspected of heresy; and that the party so convented and convicted of heresy, and continuing obstinate in the same, should, upon a certificate thereof made and delivered to the secular judge, be publicly burned before the people. In order whereunto, as in a matter which concerned the life of a subject, the king, with the advice of his Parliament, might lay down some rules for the regulating the proceedings of the bishops and other ordinaries.

FULLER.—There be two distinct things which in this point must be severally considered. 1. To declare and define, what shall be accounted heresy. 2. To condemn to death a declared heretic.

1. The power of the former was in this age fixed in the bishops, without any competition; and is so clear none can question it. Yea, by the same power, they might proceed against a declared heretic, without any leave or licence from king or Parliament, so far as church-censures, suspensions, excommunications, &c., could extend.

2. But as for the latter, "to condemn them to death," herein the Common Law began, where the Canon Law ended, and regulated their proceedings accordingly.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, certainly, it is a sorry piece of logic to conclude from hence, that, generally in all cases of heresy, “the king with advice of his Parliament directed the proceedings of the ecclesiastical courts.” A piece of logic shall I call it, or a fallacy rather? a fallacy *a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*, committed commonly, when from a proposition which is true only in some respect, with reference to time, place, and other circumstances, the sophister inferreth something as if simply true, though in itself it be most absolutely false. As, for example: “The pope, even in matters of spiritual cognizance,” (for so it followeth in our author,) “had no power over the lives of the English subjects;” and therefore had then no power to proceed against them in point of heresy.

FULLER.—I intended not, nor have I abused the reader with any fallacious argumentation. It is true, *κατὰ πάντος*, the king and Parliament “directed the proceedings of the ecclesiastical court in cases of heresy:” I mean not, to decide which were heresies, but to order the power of the bishop over declared heretics, without the direction of the statute, not to proceed to limb and life; and, I believe, my words will be found transcribed out of sir Edward Coke’s most elaborate Report of the king’s power in ecclesiastical matters.

88. DR. HEYLIN.—“Henry VII. (born in the bowels of Wales, at Pembroke, &c.) some years after plucked down the partition-wall betwixt them.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 480.) Neither so, nor so. For, First, Pembroke doth not stand “in the bowels of Wales,” but almost on the outside of it; as being situate on one of the creeks of Milford-Haven.

FULLER.—Pembroke (though verging to the sea) may properly be called “in the bowels of Wales,” beholding the Marches (next England) as the outward skin thereof. Bowels are known to the Latins by the name of *penetralia*, a *penetrando*; one must pierce and pass so far, from the outward skin, before one can come at them. So is Pembroke placed in the very *penetrals* of Wales, seeing the traveller must go sixscore miles from England, before he can come thither.

89. DR. HEYLIN.—And, Secondly, king Henry VII. did not “break down the partition-wall between Wales and England.” That was a work reserved for king Harry VIII. in the 27th of whose reign there passed an Act of Parliament, by which it was enacted, “that the country of Wales should be, stand, and continue for ever, from thenceforth, incorporated, united, and annexed to and with this realm of England; and that all and singular person and persons, born and to be born in the said principality, country, or dominion of Wales, shall have, enjoy, and inherit all and singular freedoms, liberties, rights,

privileges, and laws within this realm, and other the king's dominions, as other the king's subjects naturally born within the same have, and enjoy, and inherit." \*

And, Thirdly, between the time which our author speaks of, being the fourteenth year of king Henry IV. and the making of this Act by king Henry VIII. there passed above an hundred and twenty years; which intimates a longer time than "some years after," as our author words it.

FULLER.—Far be it from me to set variance betwixt father and son, and to make a partition-wall betwixt them, which of them first did break down the partition-wall betwixt Wales and England. The intentions of king Henry VII. were executed by king Henry VIII.; and all shall be reformed in my book accordingly. Our author proceeds:—

90. DR. HEYLIN.—"I will not complain of the dearness of this University; where seventeen weeks cost me more than seventeen years in Cambridge, even all that I had." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 490.) The ordinary and unwary reader might collect from hence, that Oxford is a chargeable place, and that all commodities there are exceeding dear, but that our author lets him know that it was on some occasion of disturbance.

FULLER.—He must be a very "ordinary and unwary reader" indeed, or an extraordinary one (if you please) of no common weakness or wilfulness, so to understand my words, which plainly expound themselves.

DR. HEYLIN.—By which it seems our author doth relate to the time of the war, when men from all parts did repair to Oxford, not as a University, but a place of safety, and the seat-royal of the king; at which time, notwithstanding, all provisions were so plentiful and at such cheap rates, as no man had reason to complain of the dearness of them. No better argument of the fertility of the soil and richness of the country in which Oxford standeth, than that the markets were not raised on the accession of such infinite multitudes as resorted to it at that time, and on that occasion. Our author therefore must be thought to relate unto somewhat else than is here expressed; and possibly may be, that his being at Oxford at that time brought him within the compass of "delinquency," and, consequently, of sequestration.

FULLER.—I commend the carefulness of the Animadvertor, tender of the honour of Oxford and Oxfordshire his native country, as I have heard from his own mouth. But herein his jealousy had not just cause,—nothing derogatory thereunto being by me intended herein. Oxfordshire hath in it as much of Rachel and Leah, "fairness and fruitfulness," as in any county in England; and so, God

willing, in my description of the English Worthies, I shall make to appear.

DR. HEYLIN.—And were it so, he hath no reason to complain of the University, or the dearness of it ; but rather of himself, for coming to a place so chargeable and destructive to him. He might have tarried where he was, (for I never heard that he was sent for,) and then this great complaint against the dearness of that University would have found no place.

FULLER.—I was once sent up thither from London ; being one of the six, who were chosen to carry a petition for peace to his majesty, from the city of Westminster and the liberties thereof, though in the way remanded by the Parliament.

As for my being sent for to Oxford, the Animadvertor, I see, hath not heard of all that was done. I thought that as St. Paul wished all “altogether such as he was, except these bonds ;” (Acts xxvi. 29 ;) so the Animadvertor would have wished all Englishmen like himself, “save in his sequestration,” and rather welcomed than jeered such as went to Oxford. But let him say and do as he pleaseth. Our author proceeds :—

91. DR. HEYLIN.—“Surely, what Charles V. is said to have said of the city of Florence, ‘that it is pity it should be seen save only on holy-days,’” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 499.) Our author is somewhat out in this, in fathering that saying on Charles V. emperor and king of Spain, which Boterus and all other authors ascribe to Charles archduke of Austria ; that is to say, to Charles of Inspruck, one of the younger sons of the emperor Ferdinand I. and consequently nephew to Charles V.

FULLER.—*Nihil dictum, quod non dictum prius* ; and it is very probable, that the one first *made*, the other *used*, the same expression.

92. DR. HEYLIN.—Nor is our author very right in taking Aquensis for Aix in Provence : “Especially,” saith he, “if, as I take it, by Aquensis Aix be meant, sited in the farthest parts of Provence, though even now the English power in France was a-waning.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 504.) For, First, the English never had any power in Provence, no interest at all therein, nor pretensions to it ; as neither had the French kings in the times our author speaks of. Provence in those days was independent of that crown, an absolute estate, and held immediately of the empire, as being a part and member of the realm of Burgundy, and in the actual possession of the dukes of Anjou ; on the expiring of which House, by the last will and testament of duke René II. it was bequeathed to Lewis XI. of France, by him and his successors to be enjoyed upon the death of Charles earl of Maine ; as it was accordingly. And, Secondly, that Bernard whom the Latin calls

*episcopus Aquensis*, is very ill taken by our author to be “bishop of Aix.” He was indeed bishop of Acqus or Aux in Guienne, called anciently *Aquæ Augustæ*, from whence those parts of France had the name of Aquitain; and not of Aix, (which the ancient writers called *Aquæ Sextiæ*,) in the country of Provence. Now Guienne was at that time in the power of the kings of England, which was the reason why this Bernard was sent with the rest of the commissioners to the Council of Basil; and being there, amongst the rest, maintained the rights and pre-eminences of the English kings.

FULLER.—There is nothing more destructive to truth, than when writers are peremptory in affirming what seems doubtful unto them. Arrant hypocrisy, for the hand to be positive in a point, when the head is (as I may say) but suppositive, as not sufficiently satisfied therein. Such men, because they scorn to doubt, lead others quite out of the way.

To prevent this mischief, I only said, “If, as I take it, by *Aquensis Aix* be meant;” for it seemed to me too long a stride, (or straddle rather,) for the legs of our English armies to have any power in Provence. And now, seeing it was but half a fault in me, it doth not deserve the Animadvertor’s whole reproof.

93. DR. HEYLIN.—In agitating of which controversy, as it stands in our author, I find mention of one Johannes de Voragine, “a worthless author.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 507.) Mistaken both in the name of the man, and his quality also. For, First, the author of the book called *Legenda Aurea*, related to in the former passage, was not *Johannes*, but *Jacobus* de Voragine. In which book, though there are many idle and unwarrantable fictions; yet, Secondly, was the man of more esteem than to pass under the character of “a worthless author,” as being learned for the times in which he lived, archbishop of Genoa, a chief city of Italy, *et moribus et dignitate magno pretio*, as Philippus Bergomensis telleth us of him, *anno* 1290, at what time he lived; most eminent for his translation of the Bible into the Italian tongue, (as we read in Vossius,)\* a work of great both difficulty and danger, as the times then were, sufficient (were there nothing else) to free him from the ignominious name of “a worthless author.”

FULLER.—I here enter my public thanks to the Animadvertor. *Jacobus* de Voragine (so it seems was his name) was a better author than I took him for: indeed, having read that Melchior Canus called the author of some Legends, “a man *ferrei oris et plumbei cordis*,” “one of an iron face and leaden heart,” I conceived him intended therein.

But if he did translate the Bible into Italian, (as I have cause to believe, knowing nothing to the contrary,) it was, as the Animad-

\* VOSSIUS *De Lat. Hist.*

vertor saith well, "a work of great both difficulty and danger, as the times then were."

I confess I have formerly, in the table of my esteem, placed this Voragine as the very lag at the lowest end thereof; but hereafter I shall say to him, "Come up hither," and provide a higher place for him in my reputation.

94. DR. HEYLIN.—A greater mistake than this, as to the person of the man, is that which follows; namely, "Humphrey duke of Gloucester, son to king Henry V." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 511.) This though I cannot look on as a fault of the press, yet I can easily consider it as a slip of the pen; it being impossible that our author should be so far mistaken in duke Humphrey of Gloucester, who was not son but brother to king Henry V.

FULLER.—This being allowed (as indeed it is) but a pen-slip, who is more faulty,—the author in the cursorily committing,—or the Animadvertor in the deliberate censuring thereof?

DR. HEYLIN.—But I cannot think so charitably of some other errors of this kind, which I find in his History of Cambridge, page 103; where amongst the English dukes which carried the title of earl of Cambridge, he reckoneth Edmond of Langley, fifth son to Edward III., Edward his son, Richard duke of York his brother, father to king Edward IV. But, First, this Richard whom he speaks of, though he were earl of Cambridge by the consent of Edward his elder brother, yet was he never duke of York; Richard being executed at Southampton for treason against king Harry V. before that king's going into France, and Edward his elder brother slain not long after in the battle of Agincourt. And, Secondly, this Richard was not the father, but grandfather, of king Edward IV. For, being married unto Anne, sister and heir unto Edmond Mortimer, earl of March, he had by her a son called Richard, improvidently restored in blood, and advanced unto the title of duke of York, by king Henry VI. *anno* 1426; who by the lady Cecily his wife, one of the many daughters of Ralph earl of Westmoreland, was father of king Edward IV., George duke of Clarence, and king Richard III. Thirdly. As Richard earl of Cambridge was not duke of York, so Richard duke of York was not earl of Cambridge; though by our author made the last earl thereof, (Hist. of Cambridge, p. 226,) before the restoring of that title on the House of the Hamiltons.

FULLER.—This hath formerly been answered at large in the Introduction,\* wherein it plainly appears, that the last Richard was duke of York and earl of Cambridge; though, I confess, it is questionable whether his father were duke of York.

However, it doth my work; namely, that the earldom of Cam-

\* See page 324 of this volume.—EDIT.



bridge was always (the first alone excepted) conferred on either a foreign prince, or an English peer of the blood-royal; an honour not communicated to any other peer in England.

DR. HEYLIN.—If our author be no better at a pedigree in private families, than he is in those of kings and princes, I shall not give him much for his *Art of Memory*, for his *History* less, and for his *Heraldry* just nothing.

FULLER.—When I intend to expose them to sale, I know where to meet with a franker chapman. None alive ever heard me pretend to the art of memory, who in my book have decried it as a trick, no art;\* and, indeed, is more of fancy than memory. I confess, some ten years since, when I came out of the pulpit of St. Dunstan's East; one (who since wrote a book thereof) told me in the vestry, before credible people, that he in Sydney College had taught me the art of memory. I returned unto him, that it was not so; *for I could not remember that I had ever seen his face*; which, I conceive, was a real refutation. However, seeing that a natural memory is the best flower in mine, and not the worst in the Animadvertor's garden, let us turn our competitions herein unto mutual thankfulness to the God of heaven.†

DR. HEYLIN.—But I see our author is as good at the succession of bishops, as in that of princes. For, saith he, speaking of Cardinal Beaufort, "He built the fair Hospital of St. Cross near Winchester; and, although Chancellor of the University of Oxford, was no grand benefactor thereunto, as were his predecessors Wickham and Wainefleet." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 512.) Wickham and Wainefleet are here made the predecessors of Cardinal Beaufort in the see of Winchester; whereas, in very deed, though he succeeded Wickham in that

\* "Holy State," title *Memory*.

† Fuller's excellent conclusion contains a grateful and truly Christian acknowledgment of the bounty of Heaven in bestowing upon him a good natural memory, which he very properly styles "the best flower in my garden." The subjoined is the account of it given by one of his biographers:—

"He had a memory so tenacious and comprehensive, that it enabled him to do things which are hardly credible. He could repeat five hundred strange words after twice hearing, and could make use of a sermon verbatim, if he once heard it. He undertook once, in passing to and fro, from Temple-Bar to the furthest part of Cheapside, to tell at his return every sign as it stood in order on both sides of the way, repeating them either backwards or forwards: and he did it exactly. His manner of writing [when thus testing his memory] was very strange and rare, from the top of the page to the bottom, something like that of the Chinese. The manner was thus: he would write near the margin the first words of every line down to the foot of the paper; then, by beginning at the head again, would so perfectly fill up every one of these lines, as, without spaces, interlineations, or contractions, would so connect the ends and beginnings, that the sense would appear as complete, as if he had written it in a continued series after the ordinary manner."—EDIT.

bishopric, he preceded Wainfleet. For, in the catalogue of the bishops of Winchester they are marshalled thus ; namely, 50, A.D. 1365, William of Wickham : 51, A.D. 1405, Henry Beaufort : 52, A.D. 1447, William de Wainfleet ; which last continued bishop till the year 1486 ; the see being kept by these three bishops above one hundred and twenty years, and thereby giving them great advantages of doing those excellent works, and founding those famous Colleges, which our author rightly hath ascribed to the first and last. But whereas our author telleth us also of this Cardinal Beaufort, that he built the Hospital of St. Cross, he is as much out in that, as he was in the other ; that Hospital being first built by Henry of Blois, brother of king Stephen and bishop of Winchester, *anno* 1129 ; augmented only, and perhaps more liberally endowed, by this potent Cardinal.\* From these foundations, made and enlarged by these three great bishops of Winchester successively, proceed we to two others raised by king Henry VI. of which our author telleth us :—

FULLER.—What a piece of Don-Quixotism is this, for the Animadvertor to fight in confutation of that which was formerly confessed ! these words being thus fairly entered in the table of errata :—

“Book iv. page 512, line 22, read it thus, *of his predecessor Wickham, or successor Wainfleet.*”

Faults thus fairly confessed, are presumed fully forgiven ; and faults thus fully forgiven, have their guilt returning no more. In the Court Christian, such might have been sued who upbraided their neighbours for incontinence, after they formerly had performed public penance for the same. And I hope the reader will allow me reparation from the Animadvertor, for a fault so causelessly taxed, after it was so clearly acknowledged and amended. Our author proceeds :—

96. DR. HEYLIN.—“This good precedent of the archbishop’s bounty ” (that is to say, the foundation of All-Souls’ College by archbishop Chicheley) “ may be presumed a spur to the speed of the king’s liberality ; who soon after founded Eaton College, &c. to be a nursery to King’s College in Cambridge.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. pp. 509, 510.) Of Eaton College, and the condition of the same, our author hath spoken here at large ; but we must look for the foundation of King’s College, in the “History of Cambridge,” page 116 ; where I find something which requireth an Animadversion. Our author there chargeth Dr. Heylin for avowing something which he cannot justify ; that is to say, for saying, “That when William of Wainfleet, bishop of Winchester, (afterwards founder of Magdalen College,) persuaded king Henry VI. to erect some monument for learning in Oxford, the king returned, *Imo potius Cantabrigiæ, ut duas (si fieri possit)*

\* CAMDEN in Hampshire, fol. 267.

*in Angliâ Academiâs habeam.* ‘Yea, rather,’ said he, ‘at Cambridge, that (if it be possible) I may have two Universities in England.’ As if Cambridge were not reputed one before the founding of King’s College therein.” But here the premisses only are the Doctor’s, the inference or conclusion is our author’s own. The Doctor infers not thereupon, that “Cambridge was not reputed an University till the founding of King’s College by king Henry VI. ;” and indeed he could not: for he acknowledged before, out of Robert de Remington, that it was made an University in the time of king Edward II. All that the Doctor says is this, “that as the University of Cambridge was of a later foundation than Oxford was, so it was long before it grew into esteem ;” that is to say, to such a measure of esteem at home or abroad, (before the building of King’s College, and the rest that followed,) but that the king might use those words in his discourse with the bishop of Winchester. And for the narrative, the Doctor (whom I have talked with in this business) doth not shame to say, that he borrowed it from that great treasury of academical antiquities, Mr. Brian Twyne, whose learned works stand good against all opponents; and that he found the passage justified by sir Isaac Wake in his *Rex Platonicus*: two persons of too great wit and judgment to relate a matter of this nature on no better ground than common *Table-talk*, and that too spoken in merriment by sir Henry Saville. Assuredly sir Henry Saville was too great a zealot for that University, and too much a friend to Mr. Wake, who was Fellow of the same College with him, to have his *Table-talk* and discourses of merriment to be put upon record, as grounds and arguments for such men to build on in that weighty controversy. And therefore when our author tells us, what he was told by Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Hubbard by Mr. Barlow, Mr. Barlow by Mr. Bust, and Mr. Bust by sir Henry Saville, it brings into my mind the like pedigree of as true a story, even that of mother Miso in sir Philip Sidney, telling the young ladies an old tale, “which a good old woman told her, which an old wise man told her, which a great learned clerk told him, and gave it him in writing; and there she had it in her prayer-book ;” as here our author hath found this on the end of his creed. Not much unlike to which is that which I find in the poet :—

*Quæ Phæbo Pater omnipotens, mihi Phæbus Apollo  
Prædixit, vobis Furiarum ego maxima pando ;*

that is to say,—

“What Jove told Phæbus, Phæbus told to me,  
And I, the chief of Furies, tell to thee.”

FULLER.—The controversy betwixt us consists about a pretended speech of king Henry VI. to bishop Wainfleet, persuading him to found a College at Oxford. To whom the king is said to return, “Yea, rather at Cambridge, that (if it be possible) I may have two Universities in England.”

A passage pregnant with an inference, which delivereth itself without any midwifery to help it; namely, that till the time of king Henry VI. Cambridge was no—or but an obscure—University; both being equally untrue.

The Animadvertor will have the speech grounded on good authority, whilst I more than suspect it to have been the frolic of the fancy of sir Isaac Wake, citing my author for my belief; which, because removed four descents, is, I confess, of the less validity. Yet is it better to take a truth from the *tenth* than a falsehood from the *first* hand.

Both our relations ultimately terminate in sir Isaac Wake, by the Animadvertor confessed the first printed reporter thereof. I confess sir Isaac Wake needed none but sir Isaac Wake to attest the truth of such thing which he had heard or seen himself. In such case, his bare name commandeth credit with posterity. But relating a passage done at a distance, some years before his great-grandfather was rocked in his cradle, we may and must do that right to our own judgment, as civilly to require of him security for what he affirmeth, especially seeing it is so clogged with such palpable improbability. Wherefore, till this knight's invisible author be brought forth into light, I shall remain the more confirmed in my former opinion, *Rex Platonicus* alone sounding to me in this point no more than Plato's Commonwealth; I mean, a mere wit-work, or brain-being, without any other real existence in nature.

97. DR. HEYLIN.—But, to proceed: "This was that Nevill, who, for extraction, estate, alliance, dependents, wisdom, valour, success, and popularity, was superior to any English subject since the Conquest." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 517.) Our author speaks this of that Richard Nevill, who was first earl of Warwick, in right of Anne his wife, sister and heir of Henry Beauchamp, the last of that family, and after earl of Salisbury by descent from his father; a potent and popular man indeed, but yet not in all or in any of those respects to be matched with Henry of Bolingbroke, son to John of Gaunt, whom our author must needs grant to have lived since the time of the Conquest. Which Henry, after the death of his father, was duke of Lancaster and Hereford, earl of Leicester, Lincoln, and Derby, &c., and Lord High Steward of England; possessed, by the donation of king Henry III., of the county palatine of Lancaster, the forfeited estates of Simon de Montfort earl of Leicester, Robert de Ferrars earl of Derby, and John lord of Monmouth; by the compact made between Thomas earl of Lancaster, and Alice his wife, of the honour of Pontefract, the whole estate of the earl of Lincoln, and a great part of the estates of the earl of Salisbury; of the goodly territories of Ogmores and Kidwelly in Wales, in right of his descent from the Chaworths; of the honour and castle of Hertford, by the grant of king Edward

III. ; and of the honour of Tickhill in Yorkshire, by the donation of king Richard II. ; and finally of a moiety of the vast estate of Humphrey de Bohun earl of Hereford, Essex, and Northampton, in right of his wife. So royal in his extraction, that he was grandchild unto one king, cousin-german to another, father and grandfather to two more. So popular when a private person, and that too in the life of his father, that he was able to raise and head an army against Richard II., with which he discomfited the king's forces, under the command of the duke of Ireland. So fortunate in his successes, that he not only had the better in the battle mentioned, but came off with honour and renown in the war of Africa, and finally obtained the crown of England. And this, I trow, renders him much superior to our author's Nevill, whom he exceeded also in this particular,—that he died in his bed, and left his estates unto his son. But having got the crown by the murder of his predecessor, it stayed but two descents in his line, being unfortunately lost by king Henry VI. : of whom, being taken and imprisoned by those of the Yorkish faction, our author telleth us—

FULLER.—It never came into my thoughts, to extend the parallel beyond the line of subjection, confining it to such as moved only in that sphere, *living and dying in the station of a subject* ; and thus far, I am sure, I am right, that this our Nevill was not equalled, much less exceeded, by any Englishman since the Conquest.

As for Henry duke of Lancaster, his coronet was afterwards turned into a crown ; and I never intended comparison with one who became a sovereign, having learned, *primum in unoquoque genere est excipiendum*.

The Animadvertor hath here taken occasion to write *much* ; but thereof *nothing* to confute me, and *little* to inform others. He deserved to be this king Henry's chaplain, (if living in that age,) for his exactness in the distinct enumeration of all his dignities and estates before he came to the crown.

98. DR. HEYLIN.—“That statesmen do admire how blind the policy of that age was, in keeping king Henry alive ; there being no such sure prison as a grave for a captive king, whose life (though in restraint) is a fair mark for the full aim of malcontents to practise his enlargement.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 518.) Our author might have spared this doctrine, so frequently in practice amongst the worldly politicians of all times and ages, that there is more need of a bridle to hold them in, than a spur to quicken them. *Parce, precor, stimulis, et fortius utere loris*,\* had been a wholesome caveat there, had any friend of his been by to have advised him of it. The murdering of deposed and captive princes, though too often practised, never found advocates to plead for it, and much less preachers to preach for it, until these latter

\* OVIDII Met. lib. ii.

times : first made a maxim of state in the school of Machiavel, who lays it down for an aphorism in point of policy ; namely, “ that great persons must not at all be touched ; or, if they be, must be made sure from taking revenge : ” \* inculcated afterwards by the lord Gray, who, being sent by king James to intercede for the life of his mother, did underhand solicit her death, and whispered nothing so much in queen Elizabeth’s ears, as, *Mortua non mordet* : “ If the Scots’ queen were once dead, she would never bite.” † But never pressed so home, never so punctually applied to the case of kings, as here I find it by our author ; of whom it cannot be affirmed, that he speaks in this case the sense of others, but positively and plainly doth declare his own. No such divinity preached in the schools of Ignatius, though fitter for the pen of a Mariana, than of a divine or minister of the church of England. Which whether it passed from him before or since the last sad accident of this nature, it comes all to one ; this being like a two-handed sword, made to strike on both sides, and, if it come too late for instruction, will serve abundantly howsoever for the justification. Another note we have, within two leaves after, as derogatory to the honour of the late archbishop, as this is dangerous to the estate of all sovereign princes, if once they chance to happen into the hands of their enemies. But of this our author will give me an occasion to speak more in another place, and then he shall hear further from me.

FULLER.—My words, as by me laid down, are so far from being “ a two-handed sword,” they have neither hilt nor blade in them ; only they hold out an handle for me, thereby to defend myself. I say, “ Statesmen did admire at the preserving king Henry alive,” and render their reason. If the Animadvertor takes me for a statesman, (whose general judgment in this point I did barely relate,) he is much mistaken in me.

Reason of state and reason of religion are stars of so different an horizon, that the elevation of the one is the depression of the other. Not that God hath placed religion and right reason diametrically opposite in themselves, so that wherever they meet they must fall out and fight. But reason, bowed by politicians to their present interest, (that is, Achitophelism,) is enmity to religion. But the less we touch this harsh string, the better music.

99. DR. HEYLIN.—Now, to go on : “ The duke requested of king Richard the earldom of Hereford, and Hereditary Constablership of England.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 528.) Not so, it was not the earldom, that is to say, the title of earl of Hereford, which the duke requested ; but so much of the lands of those earls as had been formerly enjoyed by the House of Lancaster. Concerning which we are to know, that Humphrey de Bohun, the last earl of Hereford, left behind him two daughters only ; of whom the eldest, called Eleanor, was married to Thomas of Wood-

\* “ History of Florence.”

† CAMDEN’S “ Annals,” anno 1586.



stock, duke of Gloucester; Mary, the other, married unto Henry of Bolingbroke, earl of Derby. Betwixt these two, the estate was parted; the one moiety, which drew after it the title of Hereford, falling to Henry earl of Derby; the other, which drew after it the office of Constable, to the duke of Gloucester. But the duke of Gloucester being dead, and his estate coming in fine unto his daughter, who was not able to contend, Henry V. forced her unto a subdivision, laying one half of her just partage to the other moiety. But the issue of Henry of Bolingbroke being quite extinct in the person of Edward prince of Wales, son of Henry VI. these three parts of the lands of the earls of Hereford, having been formerly incorporated into the duchy of Lancaster, remained in possession of the Crown, but were conceived by this duke to belong to him, as being the direct heir of Anne daughter of Thomas duke of Gloucester, and consequently the direct heir also of the house of Hereford. This was the sum of his demand. Nor do I find that he made any suit for the office of Constable, or that he needed so to do, he being then Constable of England, as his son, Edward the last duke of Buckingham of that family, was after him.

FULLER.—The cause of their variance is given in differently by several authors. Some say, that at once this duke requested three things of king Richard: 1. Power. 2. Honour. 3. Wealth. First. *Power*, to be Hereditary Constable of England; not to hold it as he did *pro arbitrio regis*, but in the right of his descent. Secondly. *Honour*, the earldom of Hereford. Thirdly. *Wealth*, that partage of land mentioned by the Animadvertor. I instanced only in the first; the pride of this duke being notoriously known to be more than his covetousness, not denying but that the king's denial of the land he requested had an effectual influence on his discontent. Our author proceeds;—

100. DR. HEYLIN.—“At last the coming-in of the lord Stanley, with three thousand fresh men, decided the controversy on the earl's side.” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 530.) Our author is out in this also. It was not the lord Stanley, but his brother sir William Stanley, who came in so seasonably, and thereby turned the scale, and changed the fortune of the day. For which service he was afterward made Lord Chamberlain of the new king's household, and advanced to great riches and estates, but finally beheaded by that very king for whom and to whom he had done the same. But the king looked upon this action with another eye; and therefore when the merit of this service was interposed to mitigate the king's displeasure, and preserve the man, the king remembered very shrewdly, that as he came soon enough to win the victory, so he stayed long enough to have lost it.

FULLER.—Though a courteous prolepsis might salve all the matter, yet (to prevent exceptions) in my next edition, the *lord* shall be degraded into *sir* William Stanley.



## BOOK V.

## RELATING TO THE TIME OF KING HENRY VIII.

101. DR. HEYLIN.—WE are now come to the busy times of king Henry VIII., in which the power of the church was much diminished, though not reduced to such ill terms as our author makes it. We have him here laying his foundations to overthrow that little which is left of the church's rights. His superstructures we shall see in the times ensuing, more seasonable for the practice of that authority which in this fifth book he hammereth only in the speculation.

FULLER.—I deny and defy any such design, to overthrow the foundations of the church's rights. "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" If my back could buttress them up, it should not be wanting. However, I am not sensible that any such invasion was made on the true property of the church, but that the king resumed what by God was invested in him, and what by the pope was unjustly taken from him; though none can justify every particular in the managery of the Reformation.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, First, we will begin with such *Animadversions* as relate unto this time and story, as they come in our way; leaving such principles and positions as concern the church, to the close of all; where we shall draw them all together, that our discourse and observations thereupon may come before the reader without interruption.

And the first thing I meet with, is a fault of omission; Dr. Newlen, who succeeded Dr. Jackson in the Presidentship of Corpus Christi College in Oxford, *anno* 1640, by a free election, and in a statutable way, being left out of our author's catalogue of the Presidents of C. C. C., in Oxford; (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 10;) and Dr. Stanton, who came in by the power of the Visitors above eight years after, being placed therein. Which I thought fit (though otherwise of no great moment) to take notice of, that I might do the honest man that right which our author doth not.

FULLER.—Would the Animadvertor had given me the Christian, as well as the surname of the Doctor, that I may enter it in my next edition! But I will endeavour some other ways to recover it.

Such, and greater, omissions often attend the pens of the most exact authors. Witness the lord Stanhope, created baron of Harington in Northamptonshire, *tertio Jacobi*, left out in all the editions (Latin and English) of the industrious and judicious Mr. Camden; though his junior baron (the lord Arundel of Wardour) be there inserted. This his omission proceeded not from the least

neglect, as I protest my innocence in the casual preterition of Dr. Newlen. Our author proceeds :—

102, 103. DR. HEYLIN.—“ King Henry endeavoured an uniformity of grammar all over his dominions ; that so youths, though changing their schoolmasters, might keep their learning.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 12.) That this was endeavoured by king Henry, and at last enjoined, I shall easily grant. But then our author should have told us, (if at least he knew it,) that the first hint thereof proceeded from the Convocation in the year 1530 ; in which, complaint being made, *quòd multiplex et varius in scholis grammaticalibus modus esset docendi, &c.* “ that the multiplicity of grammars did much hurt to learning ;” it was thought meet by the prelates and clergy then assembled, *ut una et eadem edatur formula auctoritate hujus sacræ synodi, in quâlibet et singulâ scholâ grammaticali per Cantuariensem provinciam usitanda, et edocenda ;* \* that is to say, “ that one only form of teaching grammar should be enjoined from thenceforth by the authority of the Convocation, to be used in all the grammar-schools of the province of Canterbury.” Which being so agreed upon, Lilly, then schoolmaster of St. Paul’s school, was thought the fittest man for that undertaking ; and he performed his part so well, that, within few years after, it was enjoined by the king’s proclamation to be used in all the schools throughout the kingdom. But here we are to note withal, that our author anticipates this business, placing it in the eleventh year of this king, *anno* 1519 ; whereas the Convocation took not this into consideration till the eighth of March, *anno* 1530 ; and certainly would not have meddled in it then, if the king had settled and enjoined it so long before.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor discovers much indiscretion, in cavilling at a well-timed truth in my book, and substituting a falsehood in the room thereof.

The endeavour of Henry VIII. for uniformity of grammar throughout all his dominions, begun (as I have placed it) 1519, William Lilly being the prime person employed for the composure thereof.

Indeed, it met not with universal reception for some years ; (habits not being easily deposed ; ) and therefore the Convocation, concurring with the king’s pleasure therein, added their assistance in the year 1530, as the Animadvertor observeth ; and soon after, by the king’s proclamation, the matter was generally effected.

But whereas he saith, that after that time, 1530, “ William Lilly was thought the fittest man for that undertaking ;” let me tell him, that a man dead five, if not eight, years before, was not fit to make a grammar.

I appeal to Bale and Pits, both which render William Lilly to

\* *Acta Convocationis, 1530.*

die in the year 1525 ; but mistaken herein ; for indeed, he died three years before, if the epitaph on his monument, made by his son George Lilly, may be believed, in a brass plate near the great north door of St. Paul's :—

*Gulielmo Lillio Paulinæ Scholæ olim præceptori primario, et Agneti conjugii, in sacratissimo hujus templi cœmeterio hinc a tergo nunc destructo consepultis, Georgius Lilius, hujus ecclesiæ canonicus, parentum memoriæ piæ consulens, tabellam hanc ab amicis conservatam, hîc reponendam curavit. Obiit ille G. L. anno Dom. 1522. Calend. Mart. Vixit annos 54.*

Wherefore this unnecessary animadversion to correct what was right before, might very well have been spared. Our author proceeds :—

104. DR. HEYLIN.—“Howsoever, it is probable, some other *Gardiner* gathered the flowers, (made the collections,) though king Henry had the honour to wear the posy.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 13.) I am not ignorant that the making of the king's book against Martin Luther is, by some popish writers, ascribed to Dr. John Fisher, then bishop of Rochester. But this cavil was not made till after this king had rejected the pope's supremacy, and consequently the less credit to be given unto it. It is well known, that his father, king Henry VII., designed him for the archbishopric of Canterbury, and to that end caused him to be trained up in all parts of learning which might enable him for that place. But his eldest brother, prince Arthur, dying, and himself succeeding in the Crown, though he had laid aside the thoughts of being a priest, he could not but retain that learning which he had acquired, and reckon it amongst the fairest flowers which adorned his diadem. Too great a clerk he was to be called “Beauclerk junior,” as if he were “as short in learning of King Henry I.” (whom commonly they called Beauclerk) “as he was in time ;” though so our author would fain have it. (History of Cambridge, p. 7.) A little learning went a great way in those early days ; which in this king would have made no show, in whose time both the arts and languages began to flourish. And if our author doth not suspect this king's *lack of learning*, he hath no reason to suspect his *lack of time* ; the work being small, the glory great, and helps enough at hand, if he wanted any. But of this enough.

FULLER.—No considerable variation from what I have written, so that my answer thereunto is not required. Let him be another Beauclerk, instead of Beauclerk junior. Our author proceeds :—

105. DR. HEYLIN.—“Which, when finished, (as Whitehall, Hampton-Court, &c.,) he either freely gave to the king, or exchanged them on very reasonable considerations.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 14.) That Hampton-Court was either “freely given” by Wolsey, or

otherwise “exchanged on very reasonable terms,” I shall grant as easily; but Whitehall was none of his to give, as belonging to the archbishop in the right of the see of York, and then called York-place. But the king’s palace at Westminster being lately burnt, and this house much beautified by the Cardinal, the king cast a longing eye upon it; and having attained the Cardinal in a *præmunire*, he seized upon this house with all the furniture thereof, as a part of the spoil; which when he found he could not hold, as being the archbishop’s and not the Cardinal’s, he sent an instrument unto him, to be signed and sealed, for the surrendry of his title and estate therein; and not content to have forced it from him, (the Cardinal honestly declaring his inability to make good the grant,) he caused the dean and chapter of York to confirm the same unto him under their common seal, in due form of law; which being obtained, and much cost bestowed upon the house, he caused it to be called Whitehall; gratifying the archbishops of York with another house, belonging then to the see of Norwich, and now called York-house.

FULLER.—My words are, “He either freely gave to the king, or exchanged them” (but I say not *freely*) “on very reasonable terms.” Now, though he did not *freely* give Whitehall to the king, he “exchanged” it (though unwillingly) “on very reasonable” considerations; seeing, for bigness, building, and circuit of ground, it then was worth ten of York-house, given to his see in lieu thereof. However, the Animadvertor is exact in some circumstances of this exchange, which I knew not before. Our author proceeds:—

106. DR. HEYLIN.—“So that lately there were maintained therein one Dean, eight Canons, three public Professors, of Divinity, Hebrew, and Greek, sixty Students,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 16.) Our author tells us, that he spent “seventeen weeks in this University;” (*Idem*, vol i. p. 490;) but he that looks on this and some other passages, would think he had not tarried there above seventeen hours.

FULLER.—Yea, the Animadvertor would persuade his reader, that I never spent seventeen weeks in Oxford, or in any other University, if all the errors be so many and great as he accuseth me of. But I prepare myself to hear his charge.

DR. HEYLIN.—For, besides his omitting of Dr. Newlen spoken of before, and his giving of the name of Censors to the Deans of Magdalen, which I find afterwards, (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 376,) he is very much mistaken in the matters of Christ Church.

FULLER.—What, Dr. Newlen again? What, if I called *the* Dean of Magdalen College, “the Censor?” *Grande piaculum!*

Do I not confess it possible, that my Cambridge *Sibboleth* may make me lisp and mispronounce the topical offices in Oxford, and

publicly desired pardon, when such mistakes are committed? Where hath the Animadvertor left or lost his ingenuity, that so another may look after, and make use of it, if so pleased?

Hereafter I shall remember that there is, though not *a Censor* now living in Magdalen College, yet there was therein *a Censurer*, (the Animadvertor,) when no just cause is given him.

I expected rather, that he would have thanked, than censured, me; who, being a Cambridge-man, and finding their printed catalogue of the Presidents of Magdalen College imperfect, as set forth by their own antiquary Brian Twyne, did amend the same, by inserting (in his due time) no meaner man than Dr. Walter Haddon, that famous and learned civilian, formerly omitted.

DR. HEYLIN.—For, First, the three Professors, of Divinity, Hebrew, and Greek, are no necessary parts of that foundation, nor can be properly said to be founded in it. Till of late times they were and might be of other Colleges, as they are at this present; this College being only bound to pay them for their annual pensions forty pounds a-piece. In after-times, king James annexed a prebend's place in this church to the Professor of Divinity, as king Charles did another to the Hebrew Reader. But, for the Greek Reader, he hath only his bare pension from it, and hath no other relation to it, but by accident only; the last Greek Reader of this House being Dr. John Perin, who died in the year 1615.

FULLER.—I say not, that those three Professors were founded in that College, but that “they are maintained therein.” And seeing the College (as the Animadvertor confesseth) pays them their salaries, my words are subject to no just exceptions.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, Secondly, he is very far short in the number of Students, diminishing them from an hundred to sixty; there being an hundred and one of that foundation by the name of Students, equivalent to the Fellows of most other Colleges in the revenues of their place and all advantages and encouragements in the way of learning. But this, perhaps, hath somewhat in it of design, that, by making the foundations of Oxford to seem less than they are, those in the other University might appear the fairer.

FULLER.—It is a mere pen-slip, and shall be amended accordingly. God knows I hatch no such envious design, who could wish, that not only sixty, but six-score six hundred, were founded, &c. therein: always provided, that the nursery exceed not the orchard; and that the Universities, by too large a plantation, breed not more scholars, than the kingdom is able to prefer and employ. Our author proceeds:—

107. DR. HEYLIN.—“ And here Wolsey had provided him a second wife; namely, Margaret countess of Alençon, sister to Francis king of France.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 18.) As much out in his French as his English heraldry. For, First, the lady Margaret here spoken of was never countess, though sometimes duchess of Alençon, as being once wife to Charles the fourth duke thereof. And, Secondly, at the time when king Henry’s divorce from queen Catherine was first agitated, this lady was not in a capacity of being projected for a wife to king Henry VIII., being then actually in the bed of another Henry; that is to say, Henry of Albret king of Navarre, as appears plainly by the articles of pacification which were to be propounded for the restoring of king Francis I. (being then prisoner in Spain, *anno* 1525) to his realm and liberty. In which it was propounded amongst other things, that Francis should not send any aid to the said Henry of Albret, (for the recovery of his kingdom,) notwithstanding that he had married the king’s sister; and other sister that king had none, but this Margaret only.\*

FULLER.—Margaret (who shall be amended duchess) of Alençon was *here*, (I mean not just *in this year*,) but *in this business*, afterwards designed by Wolsey for a wife to king Henry. Our author proceeds:—

108. DR. HEYLIN.—“ Yet had he the whole revenues of York archbishopric, (worth then little less than four thousand pounds yearly,) besides a large pension paid him out of the bishopric of Winchester.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 25.) And a large pension it was indeed, (if it were a pension,) which amounted to the whole revenue. But the truth is, that Wolsey, having gotten the bishopric of Winchester, to be holden by him *in commendam* with the See of York, was suffered to enjoy it till the time of his death, *anno* 1631. After which time, as Dr. Edward Lee succeeded him in the church of York; so then, and not before, Dr. Stephen Gardiner, principal Secretary of State, was made bishop of Winchester, by which name, and in which capacity, I find him active in the Convocation of the following year.

FULLER.—For quietness’ sake, he shall have the whole bishopric; though I have read, that after Wolsey fell in the king’s displeasure, his revenue in Winchester (which he kept *in commendam*) was reduced to a pension. Our author proceeds:—

109. DR. HEYLIN.—“ The clergy of the province of Canterbury alone bestowed on the king one hundred thousand pounds, to be paid by equal portions in the same year, say some; in four years, say others, and that in my opinion with more probability.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 34.) Here have we three authors for one thing; *some*, *others*, and *our author himself*, more knowing than all the rest “in his own opinion.” But all out alike. This great sum was not to be paid in

\* HOLLINSHED in Harry VIII.

one year, nor in four years neither, but to be paid by equal portions, (that is to say, by twenty thousand pounds *per annum*,) in the five years following. And this appears plainly by the instrument or grant itself; where, having named the sum of an hundred thousand pounds by them given the king, they declare expressly, *Ad usum majestatis ejusdem intra quinquennium ex nunc proximè et immediate sequens per quinque æquales portiones solvenda, &c.* The first payment to be made the morrow after Michaelmas-day then next ensuing after the day of the date thereof, which was the 22nd of March, 1530.

FULLER.—Not reckoning the first sum, which was paid down on the nail, that had just four years assigned them for the payment of the remainder. Our author proceeds:—

110. DR. HEYLIN.—“But he might have remembered, which also produced the peerless queen Elizabeth, who perfected the Reformation.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 37.) Either our author speaks not this for his own opinion, as in that before; or if he do, it is an opinion of his own, in which he is not like to find many followers. The Puritan party, whom he acts for in all this work, will by no means grant it; comparing that most excellent lady, in their frequent pasquils, to an idle housewife, who sweeps the middle of the house to make a show, but leaves all the dirt and rubbish behind the door. The grand composers of the Directory do persuade themselves, that “if the first Reformers had been then alive, they would have joined with them in the work, and laboured for a further Reformation.”\* And what else hath been clamoured for during all her reign, and by the ring-leaders of the faction endeavoured ever since her death, but to carry on the work of Reformation from one step to another, till they had brought it unto such a perfection as they vainly dreamed of, and of which now we feel and see the most bitter consequences? And as for the prelatical party, the “high royalists,” as our author calls them, they conceive the Reformation was not so perfected in the time of that prudent queen, but that there was somewhat left to do for her two successors; that is to say, the altering of some Rubrics in the Book of Common-Prayer, the adding of some Collects at the end of the Litany, the enlargement of the common Catechism, a more exact translation of the Bible than had been before, the settling of the church upon the canons of 1603, and, finally, a stricter and more hopeful course for suppressing popery, and for the maintenance both of conformity and uniformity by the canons of 1640.

FULLER.—I have the company of many honest and learned men going before, with, or after me, in the same opinion.

Perfection, in relation to the church, is two-fold: absolute or exact, gradual or comparative:

The former is only Christ's work to perform; for whom alone

\* “Preface to the Directory.”



the honour is reserved, to present the church “without spot or wrinkle to his Father.”

The latter, namely, gradual and comparative perfection, may be attributed to particular militant churches.

Queen Elizabeth did *gradually* perfect the Reformation, leaving it in a far better condition than she found it in, in the reign of king Edward VI. Yet do I not deny but that her successors made commendable additions thereunto; notwithstanding all whose endeavours, I doubt not but still something did remain to be amended; so that it will be *perfectio perficienda* as long as the church is militant.

The Animadvertor must not strain up perfection (when applicable to any church on earth) too high to the pin, with which “the spirits of just men are made perfect,” Heb. xii. 23. For as long as the church hath a *form* on earth, it will be subject to *deformities*, and consequently will need *reformation*. Our author proceeds:—

111, 112. DR. HEYLIN.—“And now I cannot call king Henry a *bachelor*, because once married; nor a *married man*, because having no wife; nor properly a *widower*, because his wife was not dead.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 39.) Our author speaks this of Henry VIII. immediately after his divorce, but is much mistaken in the matter. King Henry was so averse from living without a wife, that he thought it more agreeable to his constitution to have two wives together, than none at all. To that end, while the business of the divorce remained undecided, he was married privately to the lady Anne Boleyn, on the 14th of November,\* (Stow puts it off till the 25th of January then next following,) by Dr. Rowland Lee, his chaplain, promoted not long after to the bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield; the divorce not being sentenced till the April following. And whereas our author tells us in the following words, that “soon after” he was solemnly married to the lady Anne Boleyn, he is in that mistaken also. King Henry, though he was often married, yet would not be twice married to the same woman; that being a kind of bigamy, or Anabaptistry in marriage, to be hardly met with. All that he did in order to our author’s meaning is, that he avowed the marriage openly, which before he had contracted in private; the lady Anne Boleyn being publicly showed as queen on Easter-eve, and solemnly crowned on Whitsunday, being June the second.† Assuredly, unless our author makes no difference between a coronation and a marriage, or between a marriage solemnly made, and a public owning of a marriage before contracted; king Harry cannot be affirmed to have married Anne Boleyn solemnly after the divorce, as our author telleth us.

FULLER.—It will rectify all, if I change those words “having

\* HOLLINSHED, p. 129.

† STOW in Henry VIII. p. 562.

no wife," into, "as yet publicly owning no wife;" which shall be done accordingly. Our author proceeds:—

113. DR. HEYLIN.—"Though many wild and distempered expressions be found therein, yet they contain the protestant religion in ore, which since, by God's blessing, is happily refined." (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 69.) Our author speaks this of a paper containing many erroneous doctrines presented by the Prolocutor to the Convocation: some few of which, as being part of Wickliffe's Gospel, and chief ingredients in the composition of the new protestant religion lately taken up, I shall here subjoin:—

"1. That the sacrament of the altar is nothing else but a piece of bread, or a *little predie round-robin*.

"2. That priests have no more authority to minister sacraments than the laymen have.

"3. That all ceremonies accustomed in the church, which are not clearly expressed in Scripture, must be taken away, because they are men's inventions.

"4. That the church, commonly so called, is the old synagogue; and that the church is the congregation of good men only.

"5. That God never gave grace nor knowledge of holy Scripture to any great estate or rich man; and that they in no wise follow the same.

"6. That all things ought to be common.

"7. That it is as lawful to christen a child in a tub of water at home, or in a ditch by the way, as in a font-stone in the church.

"8. That it is no sin or offence to eat white-meats, eggs, butter, cheese, or flesh in Lent, or other fasting-days commanded by the church, and received by consent of Christian people.

"9. That it is as lawful to eat flesh on Good-Friday, as upon Easter-day, or other times in the year.

"10. That the ghostly father cannot give or enjoin any penance at all.

"11. That it is sufficient for a man or woman to make their confession to God alone.

"12. That it is as lawful at all times to confess to a layman, as to a priest.

"13. That it is sufficient that the sinner do say, 'I know myself a sinner.'

"14. That bishops, ordinaries, and ecclesiastical judges, have no authority to give any sentence of excommunication or censure, ne yet to absolve or loose any man from the same.

"15. That it is not necessary or profitable to have any church or chapel to pray in, or to do any divine service in.

"16. That buryings in churches and church-yards be unprofitable and vain.

"17. That the rich and costly ornaments in the church are rather high displeasure than pleasure or honour to God.

“ 18. That our Lady was no better than another woman, and like a bag of pepper or saffron when the spice is out.

“ 19. That prayers, suffrages, fasting, or alms-deeds, do not help to take away sin.

“ 20. That holy-days, ordained and instituted by the church, are not to be observed and kept in reverence, inasmuch as all days and times be alike.

“ 21. That ploughing and carting, and such servile work, may be done in the same, without any offence at all, as on other days.

“ 22. That it is sufficient and enough to believe, though a man do no good works at all.

“ 23. That, seeing Christ hath shed his blood for us, and redeemed us, we need not to do any thing at all, but to believe and repent if we have offended.

“ 24. That no human constitutions or laws do bind any Christian man, but such as be in the Gospels, Paul's Epistles, or the New Testament; and that a man may break them without any offence at all.

“ 25. That the singing or saying of mass, matins, or even-song, is but a roaring, howling, whistling, mumming, tomring, and juggling, and the playing on the organs a foolish vanity.”

This is our author's “golden ore,” out of which his new protestant religion was to be extracted; so happily refined, that there is nothing of the old Christian religion to be found therein. Which though our author doth defend as “expressions rather than opinions,” “the careers of the soul, and extravagancies of human infirmity,” as he doth the rest; yet he that looks upon these points, and sees not in them the rude draught and lineaments of the Puritan platform, which they have been hammering since the time of Cartwright and his associates, must either have better eyes than mine, or no eyes at all. I see, our author looks for thanks for this discovery, for publishing the paper which contained these new Protestant truths; and I give him mine.

FULLER.—I have many things to return in this contest: First. Had I garbled the opinions of my own head, and not presented them to the reader, as I found them presented in the records of the Convocation, then the Animadvertor had had just advantage against me.

Secndly. He taketh exception at me in his “Introduction,” for not giving-in the degrees by which heterodoxies in religion were ejected and cast out: yet now he is offended at me, because I go about to do it, showing how bad religion was before the Reformation, even in the best professors thereof.

Thirdly. It is more than probable, that these opinions, presented by such as were disaffected to the Reformation, were not over-favourably stated, but rather worded to the disadvantage.

Fourthly. Some of these opinions, thus condemned by the Animadvertor, are sound in themselves. I instance in that which in

this his list is the eleventh in number ; namely, “ That it is sufficient for a man or woman to make confession to God alone.” This at this day is defended by the protestant church ; which though commending confession as expedient in some cases, especially when the afflicted conscience cannot otherwise get any ease, yet doth it not command it on any as necessary, *necessitate præcepti*, so that the omission thereof should amount to a sin. I am confident that the Animadvertor himself never solemnly confessed his sins to any but to God alone. And it is injurious in him, to demand of another to do that which was never done by himself.

Lastly. How unjust were it to put all Jeremiah’s “ bad figs by themselves,” (Jer. xxiv. 2,) and thence to conclude all the rest (which indeed were “ very good ”) to be like unto them ! Such the dealing of the Animadvertor herein, who hath culled out the very refuse and dross of the dross in these opinions, and left out the rest, then maintained by God’s people in opposition to the errors and superstitions of that age, some whereof are here inserted :—

“ 1. They deny extreme unction to be any sacrament.

“ 2. That all those are antichrists, who deny the laity the sacrament under both kinds.

“ 3. That it is plain idolatry, to set up any lights before any images, or in any place of the church in time of divine service, as long as the sun giveth light.

“ 4. That auricular confession is invented to know the secrets of men’s hearts, and to pull money out of their purse.

“ 5. That saints are not to be invocated, and that they understand not, nor know nothing of our petitions, nor can be mediators or intercessors betwixt us and God.

“ 6. That dirges, masses, &c. done for the souls of those which are departed out of this world, are but vain, and of no profit.

“ 7. That souls departed go straight to heaven, others to hell.

“ 8. That there is no mean place betwixt heaven and hell, where souls departed may be afflicted.

“ 9. That there is no distinction of sin, to be venial and mortal.

“ 10. That hallowed water, bread, candles, ashes, palms, are of none effect, and are only used to seduce people.”

The rest I refer to my “ Church-History.”

Had that all been like these, I would have called them “ the gold ;” but (because of many errors mixed amongst them) I resume my metaphor, and term them “ the golden ore,” out of which the Reformed Christian religion was extracted. And let the author and reader join in their thanks to God’s goodness, by whose blessing on the pious endeavours of the Reformers, the “ bad figs ” (I mean those false, indiscreet, scandalous, and dangerous doctrines)

are cashiered and condemned, and the “good ones” (understand me, the positions which were pious and orthodox) retained, defended, and practised at this day in the church of England. Our author proceeds :—

114. DR. HEYLIN.—“At this time also were the stews suppressed by the king’s command.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 111.) And I could wish that some command had been laid upon our author by the Parliament to suppress them also, and not to have given them any place in the present “History,” especially not to have produced those arguments by which some shameless persons endeavoured “to maintain both the conveniency and necessity of such common brothel-houses.” Had bishop Jewel been alive, and seen but half so much from Dr. Harding, pleading in behalf of the common women permitted by the pope in Rome, he would have thought, that to call him, “an advocate for the stews,” had not been enough.\* But that Doctor was not half so wise as our author is, and doth not fit each argument with a several antidote as our author doth ; hoping thereby, but vainly hoping, that the arguments alleged will “be washed away.” Some of our late critics had a like design, in marking all the wanton and obscene epigrams in Martial with a hand (✍) or asterism, (\*) to the intent that young scholars, when they read that author, might be fore-warned to pass them over : whereas, on the contrary, it was found, that too many young fellows, or “wanton wits,” as our author calls them, did ordinarily skip over the rest, and pitch on those which were so marked and set out unto them. And much I fear, that it will so fall out with our author also ; whose arguments will be studied and made use of, when his answers will not.

FULLER.—The commendable act of king Henry VIII. in suppressing the stews, may well be reported in “Church-History,” it being recorded in scripture to the eternal praise of king Asa, that “he took away the Sodomites out of the land,” 1 Kings xv. 12. I hope my collection of arguments in confutation of such sties of lust, will appear to any rational reader of sufficient validity.

Indeed, it is reported of Zeuxis, that famous painter, that he so lively pictured a boy with a rod in his hand, carrying a basket of grapes, that birds (mistaking them for real ones) pecked at them ; and whilst others commended his art, he was angry with his own workmanship, confessing, that if he had made the boy but as well as the grapes, the birds durst not adventure at them.

I have the same just cause to be offended with my own endeavours, if the arguments against those schools of wantonness should prove insufficient ; though I am confident, that, if seriously considered, they do in their own true weight preponderate those pro-

duced in favour of them. However, if my well-intended pains be abused by such who only will feed on the poisons, wholly neglecting the antidotes, their destruction is of themselves, and I can wash my hands of any fault therein.

But methinks the Animadvertor might well have passed this over in silence, for fear of awaking sleeping wantonness, jogged by this his note; so that if my arguments, only presented in my book, be singly—this his animadversion is doubly—guilty on the same account, occasioning loose eyes to reflect on that which otherwise would not be observed. Our author proceeds:—

115. DR. HEYLIN.—“Otherwise, (some suspect,) had he survived king Edward VI. we might presently have heard of a king Henry the ninth.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 130.) Our author speaks this of Henry Fitz-Roy, the king’s natural son by Elizabeth Blunt, and the great disturbance he might have wrought to the king’s two daughters in their succession to the crown. A prince, indeed, whom his father very highly cherished, creating him duke of Somerset and Richmond, earl of Nottingham, and earl marshal of England, and raising him to no small hopes of the crown itself, as appears plainly by the statute 22 Henry VIII. c. 7. But whereas our author speaks it on a supposition of his surviving king Edward VI. he should have done well in the first place to have informed himself, whether this Henry and prince Edward were at any time alive together. And if my books speak true, they were not; Henry of Somerset and Richmond dying the 22nd of July, *anno* 1536; prince Edward not being born till the 12th of October, *anno* 1537. So that if our author had been but as good at law or grammar, as he is at heraldry, he would not have spoken of a survivorship in such a case, when the one person had been long dead before the other was born.

FULLER.—Terms of law, when used not in law-books, nor in any solemn court, but in common discourse, are weaned from their critical sense, and admit more latitude. If the word *surviving* should be tied up to legal strictness, *survivor* is applicable to none save only to such who are joint-tenants. However, because *co-viving* is properly required in a *survivor*, those my words, “had he survived,” shall be altered into “had he lived to survive prince Edward;” and then all is beyond exception.

116—120. DR. HEYLIN.—These incoherent Animadversions being thus passed over, we now proceed to the examination of our author’s principles, for weakening the authority of the church, and subjecting it in all proceedings to the power of Parliaments. Concerning which he had before given us two rules, preparatory to the great business which we have in hand. First. “That the proceedings of the canon law were subject, in whatsoever touched temporals, to secular laws and

national customs. And the laity at pleasure limited canons in this behalf." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 290.) And, Secondly, "that the king, by consent of Parliament, directed the proceedings of the ecclesiastical court in cases of heresy." (*Idem*, vol. i. p. 474.) And if the ecclesiastical power was thus curbed and fettered when it was at the highest, there is no question to be made but that it was much more obnoxious to the secular courts, when it began to sink in reputation, and decline in strength. How true and justifiable, or rather how unjustifiable and false, these two principles are, we have shown already ; \* and must now look into the rest, which our author, in pursuance of the main design, hath presented to us. But, First, we must take notice of another passage concerning the calling of Convocations or synodical meetings, formerly called by the two archbishops in their several provinces, by their own sole and proper power, as our author grants, (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 43,) to which he adds :—

"But after the Statute of Premunire was made, (which did much restrain the papal power, and subject it to the laws of the land,) archbishops called no more Convocations by their sole and absolute command, but at the pleasure of the king." (*Idem*, p. 44.) In which I must confess myself to be much unsatisfied, though I find the same position in some other authors. My reasons two : 1. Because there is nothing in the Statute of Premunire to restrain the archbishops from calling these meetings, as before ; that Act extending only to "such as purchase or pursue, or cause to be purchased or pursued, in the court of Rome, or elsewhere, any such translations, processes, sentences of excommunication, bulls, instruments, or any other things whatsoever, which touch the king, against him, his crown, and his regality, or his realm ; or to such as bring within the realm, or them receive, or make thereof notification, or any other execution whatsoever within the same realm, or without," &c.† And, 2. Because I find in the statute of the submission of the clergy, that it was recognised and acknowledged by the clergy in their Convocation, that the Convocation of the said clergy is, always hath been, "and ought to be assembled always by the king's writ." And if they had been always called by the king's writ, then certainly before the Statute of Premunire ; for that the whole clergy in their Convocation should publicly declare and avow a notorious falsehood, especially in a matter of fact, is not a thing to be imagined. I must confess myself to be at a loss in this intricate labyrinth, unless perhaps there were some critical difference in those elder times between a Synod and a Convocation ; the first being called by the archbishops in their several and respective provinces, as the necessities of the church—the other only by the king, as his occasions and affairs—did require the same. But whether this were so or not, is not much material, as the case now stands ; the clergy not assembling since the 25th of king Henry VIII. but as they

\* Both these passages have been the subjects of Heylin's Animadversions, in the preceding pages, 417, 441.—EDIT.

† Stat. 25 Henry VIII. c. 19.



are convocated and convened by the king's writ only. I only add, that the time and year of this submission is mistaken by our author, who placeth it in 1533; whereas indeed the clergy made this acknowledgment and submission in their Convocation, *anno* 1532; though it passed not into an Act or Statute till the year next following. Well then, suppose the clergy called by the king's authority, and all their Acts and Constitutions ratified by the royal assent, are they of force to bind the subject to submit and conform unto them? Not, if our author may be judge; for he tells us plainly,—

“That even such Convocations with the royal assent, subject not any (for recusancy to obey their canons) to a civil penalty in person or property, until confirmed by Act of Parliament.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 45.) I marvel where our author took up this opinion; which he neither finds in the registers of Convocation, nor records of Parliament. Himself hath told us, that “such Canons and Constitutions as were concluded-on in Synods or Convocations, (before the passing of the Statute of Premunire,) were, without any further ratification, obligatory to all subjected to their jurisdiction.” (*Idem*, p. 43.) And he hath told us also of such Convocations as had been called between the passing of the Statute of Premunire, and the Act for submission, that “they made canons which were binding, although none other than synodical authority did confirm the same.” Upon which premisses I shall not fear to raise this syllogism; namely,

That power which the clergy had in their Convocations before their submission to the king, to bind the subject by their Canons and Constitutions “without any further ratification than [their] own synodical authority,” the same they had when the king's power, signified in his royal assent, was added to them:

But the clergy (by our author's own confession) had power in their Convocations before their submission to the king, to bind the subject by their Canons and Constitutions, without any further ratification than their own synodical authority:

*Ergò*, they had the same power to bind the subjects, when the king's power, signified by the royal assent, was added to them.

The Minor being granted by our author, as before is showed, the Major is only to be proved. And for the proof hereof, I am to put the reader in mind of a Petition or Remonstrance exhibited to the king by the House of Commons, *anno* 1532, in which they showed themselves aggrieved, that the clergy of this realm should act authoritatively and supremely in the Convocations, and they in Parliament do nothing but as it was confirmed and ratified by royal assent. By which it seems that there was nothing then desired by the House of Commons, but that the Convocation should be brought down to the same level with the Houses of Parliament; and that their Acts and Constitutions should not bind the subject, as before, in their goods and possessions, until they were confirmed and ratified by the regal power. The answer unto which Remonstrance being drawn up by Dr. Gardi-

ner, then newly-made bishop of Winchester, and allowed of by both Houses of Convocation, was by them presented to the king. But the king, not satisfied with this answer, resolves to bring them to his bent, lest else perhaps they might have acted something to the hinderance of his divorce, which was at that time in agitation ; and therefore, on the 10th of May, he sends a paper to them by Dr. Fox, (after bishop of Hereford,) in which it was peremptorily required, "That no Constitution or Ordinance shall be hereafter by the clergy enacted, promulged, or put in execution, unless the king's highness do approve the same by his high authority and royal assent ; and his advice and favour be also interponed for the execution of every such Constitution among his highness's subjects." And though the clergy, on the receipt of this paper, removed first to the chapel of St. Catherine's, and after unto that of St. Dunstan's, to consult about it ; yet found they no saint able to inspire them with a resolution contrary to the king's desires ; and therefore upon the Wednesday following, being the 15th of the same month, they made their absolute submission, binding themselves, *in verbo sacerdotii*, not to make or execute any canons or other synodical Constitutions, but as they were from time to time enabled by the king's authority. But this submission, being made unto the king in his single person, and not as in conjunction with his Houses of Parliament, could neither bring the Convocation under the command of Parliaments, nor render them obnoxious to the power thereof, as indeed it did not. But to the contrary hereof it is said by our author, that—

"He, (namely, the king,) by the advice and consent of his clergy in Convocation, and great Council in Parliament, resolved to reform the church under his inspection from gross abuses crept into it." (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 50.) To this I need no other answer than our author himself, who, though in this place he makes the Parliament to be joined in commission with the Convocation, as if a joint agent in that great business of reforming the church ; yet in another place he tells us another tale. For, "it will appear," saith he, (and I can tell from whom he saith it,) "upon serious examination, that there was nothing done in the Reformation of religion, save what was acted by the clergy in their Convocations, or grounded on some Act of theirs precedent to it, with the advice, counsel, and consent of the bishops and most eminent churchmen ; confirmed upon the post-fact, and not otherwise, by the civil sanction, according to the usage of the best and happiest times of Christianity." (*Idem*, p. 42.) So then the Reformation of the church was acted chiefly by the king with the advice of the clergy in their Convocation ; the confirmation on the post-fact by the king in Parliament ; and that, (by his leave,) not in all the acts and particulars of it, but in some few only ; for which, consult the tract entituled, "The Way and Manner of the Reformation of the Church of England." Now as our author makes the Parliament a joint assistant with the king in the Reformation, so he conferreth on

Parliaments the supreme power of ratifying and confirming all synodical Acts.

“The Parliament,” saith he, “did notify and declare that ecclesiastical power to be in the king, which the pope had formerly unjustly invaded ; yet so, that they reserved to themselves the confirming power of all Canons ecclesiastical ; so that the person or property of refusers should not be subjected to temporal penalty without consent of Parliament.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 57.) But certainly there is no such matter in that Act of Parliament, in which the submission of the clergy, and the authority of the king grounded thereupon, is notified and recorded to succeeding times ; nor any such reservation to themselves of a confirming power, as our author speaks of, in any Act of Parliament (I can knowingly and boldly say it) from that time to this. Had there been any such privilege, any such reservation as is here declared, their power in confirming ecclesiastical Canons had been lord paramount to the king’s ; who could have acted nothing in it, but as he was enabled by his Houses of Parliament. Nor is this only a new and unheard-of paradox, an heterodoxy (as I may call it) in point of law, but plainly contrary to the practice of the kings of England from that time to this ; there being no synodical Canons or Constitutions (I dare as boldly say this too) confirmed in Parliament, or any otherwise ratified than by the superadding of the royal assent. For proof whereof, look we no further than the Canons of 1603 and 1640 confirmed by the two kings respectively, and without any other authority concurring with them in these following words : namely, “We have therefore for us, our heirs, and lawful successors, of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, given, and by these presents do give, our royal assent according to the form of the said Statute or Act of Parliament aforesaid, to all and every of the said Canons, Orders, Ordinances, and Constitutions, and to all and every thing in them contained. And furthermore, we do not only by our said prerogative royal, and supreme authority, in causes ecclesiastical, ratify, confirm, and establish, by these our letters patents, the said Canons, Orders, Ordinances, and Constitutions, and all and every thing in them contained, as is aforesaid ; but do likewise propound, publish, and straitly enjoin and command by our said authority, and by these our letters patents, the same to be diligently observed, executed, and equally kept by all our loving subjects of this our kingdom, both within the province of Canterbury and York, in all points wherein they do or may concern every or any of them according to this our will and pleasure hereby signified and expressed.” No other power required to confirm these Canons, or to impose them on the people, but the king’s alone. And yet, I trow, there are not a few particulars, in which those Canons do extend to the property and persons of such refusers as are concerned in the same ; which our author may soon find in them, if he list to look. And having so done, let him give us the like precedent for his Houses of Parliament (either abstractedly in themselves,

or in co-operation with the king) in confirming Canons ; and we shall gladly quit the cause, and willingly submit to his \* ter judgment.

But if it be objected, as perhaps it may, "That the subsidies granted by the clergy in the Convocation, are ratified and confirmed by Act of Parliament, before they can be levied either on the grantors themselves, or the rest of the clergy ;"—

I answer, That this makes nothing to our author's purpose, that is to say, that "the person or property of refusers should not be subjected to temporal penalty, without consent of Parliament." For, First, before the submission of the Clergy to king Henry VIII. they granted subsidies and other aids unto the king in their Convocations, and levied them upon the persons concerned therein, by no other way than the usual censures of the church, especially by suspension and deprivation, if any refuser proved so refractory as to dispute the payment of the sum imposed. And by this way they gave and levied that great sum of an hundred thousand pounds in the province of Canterbury only ; by which they bought their peace of the said king Henry, at such time as he had caused them to be attainted in the Premunire. And, Secondly, there is a like precedent for it, since the said submission. For whereas the clergy in their Convocation in the year 1585, being the 27th year of queen Elizabeth, had given that queen a subsidy of four shillings in the pound, confirmed by Act of Parliament in the usual way ; they gave her at the same time (finding their former gift too short for her present occasions) a benevolence of two shillings in the pound to be raised upon all the clergy, by virtue of their own synodical Act only, under the penalty of such ecclesiastical censures as before were mentioned. Which precedent was after followed by the clergy in their Convocation, *anno* 1640, the instrument of the grant being the same *verbatim* with that before ; though so it happened, (such influence have the times on the actions of men,) that they were quarreled and condemned for it by the following Parliament in the time of the king, and not so much as checked at, or thought to have gone beyond their bounds, in the time of the queen. And for the ratifying of their Bill by Act of Parliament, it came up first at such times (after the submission before-mentioned) as the kings of England, being in distrust of their clergy, did not think fit to empower them by their letters patents for the making of any synodical Acts, Canons, or Constitutions whatsoever, by which their subsidies have been levied in former times, but put them off to be confirmed and made obligatory by Act of Parliament. Which, being afterwards found to be the more expedite way, and not considered as derogatory to the church's rights, was followed in succeeding times without doubt or scruple ; the church proceeding in all other cases by her native power, even in cases where both the person and property of the subject were alike concerned, as by the Canons [of] 1603, 1640, and many of those passed in queen

\* I believe this should be *better*, as may appear in the *errata*. (Page 350.) But because the page is mistaken, 121 for 101, I dare not alter it.

Elizabeth's time, (though not so easy to be seen,) doth at full appear. Which said, we may have leisure to consider of another passage relating not unto the power of the church, but the wealth of the churchmen; of which thus our author:—

FULLER.—I conceived it civil to suffer the Animadvertor (to use his own phrase) *parler le tout*, “to speak all out” in this long discourse; which, although it consisteth of several notes, yet because all treat of the same subject, and because a relative strength might result thereby to the whole, I have presented it entire. Yet, when all is said, I find very little I have learned thereby, and less (if any thing) which I am to alter.

These my two preparatory rules (as the Animadvertor terms them) I have formerly stated, and proved, and here intend no repetition.

It is no beam- and but a moat-fault at most, if I have dated the submission of the clergy to the king, not from the first private performance, but the passing thereof into print and public cognizance. Thus the age of children are by their parents reckoned from their birth, but by others from their entrance in the register.

But the main fault (and that a foul one, if true) laid to my charge is, for “weakening the authority of the church, and subjecting it to the power of Parliaments.” But know, it is past the might and spite of the most malicious man finally to weaken the just authority of the church, God having solemnly promised “that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” Yet princes (as king Henry VIII. did) might retrench the power of the church, (or ambitious churchmen rather,) when they invaded the just privileges of others.

I shall only return a few plain and general answers to what is objected. First. Before I entered on the difficult subject of Synods and Convocations, (before and since the clergy's submission,) with their respective powers, I placed, as followeth:—

“This I humbly conceive to be the difference betwixt the three kinds of Convocations, submitting what I have written to the censure and correction of the learned in the law, conscious of my own ignorance therein; as, indeed, such skill neither is to be expected nor required in one of my profession, who am ready, with willingness, yea, with cheerfulness, yea, with thankfulness to God and man, publicly to recall and retract what any such convince me to have mistaken herein; hoping that my stumbling in so dark a subject, may prevent the failing of others.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 45.)

Having thus humbly *desired* (I say not, *deserved*) favour, I hope it will be indulged unto me.

Secondly. I presume to tender this (I hope, reasonable) motion to

the reader, that, seeing the Animadvertor not only freely confesseth this subject to be “an intricate labyrinth,” but also fairly acknowledgeth, that “he findeth the positions I maintain in *some other authors*,” that I may be discharged, and that the guilt (if any) may be derived on such authors as have misguided me.

Thirdly. When I use the word “Parliament,” it expoundeth itself what was meant thereby, (capable in that age of no other comment,) namely, the aggregation of the king, lords, and commons.

Fourthly. I distinguish betwixt a consultative, conclusive, and punitive power in matters of religion. 1. The *consultative* power God hath intrusted his church with, and the clergy as the representative thereof. 2. The *conclusive* power also is invested in them, so far forth as to declare what is orthodox, and what heretical. 3. But the *punitive* power, especially when exceeding church-censures, and extending to life, limb, and estate, is in the Parliament; that so neither royal prerogative nor subjects’ right may be injured.

Fifthly. I distinguish betwixt the power which the Convocation had over the clergy, and what they have over the laity. Over the estates of the latter, they have no power.

As for the clergy, they are all represented, by their voluntary elections, in their clerks or proctors. *Volenti non fit injuria*, “A man that is willing is not wronged.” What sums, therefore, they give away of the clergy, they may be presumed empowered therein with the consent of the clergy. However, to clear all doubts, the consent of Parliament hath (since the submission of the clergy) been required unto it.

As for the black swan in the reign of queen Elizabeth, I mean that single and signal instance of that unparliament-empowered Convocation, which gave that supplemental subsidy to queen Elizabeth; I humbly conceive that the popularity of so peerless a princess, the necessity of her occasions, and the tranquillity of those times, (a happiness denied in our age,) made that *unquestioned*, which might be *questionable* if any turbulent clergyman had proved recusant in payment.

As to the Convocation, 1640, let me request the reader, that I may without danger humbly tender my opinion herein. That Convocation (as all others) consisted of bishops, deans, archdeacons, and clerks. Of these, the three former acted only in their personal capacities; and, carrying their own purses in their own pockets, might give subsidies to the king to what proportion they pleased, and justify the doing thereof.

Not so the fourth and last members, being clerks chosen for their respective cathedrals and diocesses, legally to sit as long as the Par-



liament lasted. After the dissolution whereof, they desisted to be public persons, lost the notion of representatives, and returned to their private condition. In which capacity they might have given for themselves what sums they pleased, but could not vote away the estates of other clergymen, except the respective cathedrals and diocesses had re-elected them ; which had it been done, they might no doubt have justified the giving away of subsidies, as authorized thereunto, though the Parliament had been dissolved, seeing “every man may do with his own as he pleaseth ;” and the diffusive clergy were justly interpreted to do what was done by their proctors. Truth may be blamed, but cannot be shamed ; and I have unbo-somed my thoughts and judgment herein. But this outswelleth the proportion of my book, and let me make a fair motion to the Animadvertor. I resume my two former propositions ; namely,—

“1. The proceedings of the canon law, in what touched temporals of life, limb, and estate, was always limited with the secular laws and national customs of England.

“2. That the king, by consent of Parliament, directed the proceedings of ecclesiastical courts, against declared heretics, so that they could not punish them in life or limb, but as limited by the statute.”

If the Animadvertor, who hath leisure and ability, be pleased, in confutation of these my propositions, to write a few sheets, (it being richly worth his and the reader’s pains,) clearly, briefly, fully, and fairly, *without the least dash of ill language*, subscribing his name thereunto ; I will, God willing, return him my answer qualified accordingly ; and, though I confess the Animadvertor hath the advantage of me at the weapon of law, yet my confidence of a good cause will make me undertake the challenge ; always provided, that no advantage be taken against us by any for delivering our judgments and consciences in so nice a controversy. For the present I forbear, because this dispute is substantive enough to stand by itself, and too large to be adjected to this book. Our author proceeds :—

121—124. DR. HEYLIN.—“I have heard,” saith he, “that queen Elizabeth, being informed that Dr. Pilkington, bishop of Durham, had given ten thousand pounds in marriage with his daughter ; and being offended that a prelate’s daughter should equal a princess in portion, took away one thousand pounds a-year from that bishopric, and assigned it for the better maintenance of the garrison of Berwick.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 129.) In telling of which story our author commits many mistakes, as in most things else. For, First, to justify the queen’s displeasure, (if she were displeased,) he makes the bishop richer, and the portion greater, than indeed they were. The ten thousand pounds being shrunk to eight ; and that eight thousand pounds



not given to one daughter, (as is here affirmed,) but divided equally between two ; whereof the one was married to Sir James Harrington, the other unto Dunch of Berkshire. (*Idem*, p. 513.) Secondly. This could be no cause of the queen's displeasure, and much less of the courtiers' envy ; that bishop having sat in the see of Durham above seventeen years. And, certainly, he must needs have been a very ill husband if, out of such a great revenue, he had not saved five hundred pounds *per annum* to prefer his children ; the income being as great, and the charges of hospitality less than they have been since. Thirdly. The queen did not take away a thousand pounds a-year from that bishopric, as is here affirmed. The lands were left to it as before ; but, in regard the garrison of Berwick preserved the bishop's lands and tenants from the spoil of the Scots ; the queen thought fit, that the bishops should contribute towards their own defence, imposing on them an annual pension of a thousand pounds for the better maintaining of that garrison. Fourthly. Bishop Pilkington was no Doctor, but a Bachelor of Divinity only ; and possibly had not been raised by our author to an higher title and degree than the University had given him, but that he was "a conniver at nonconformity," as our author telleth us. (*Idem*, p. 513.) Lastly. I shall here add, that I conceive the pension, above-mentioned, not to have been laid upon that see after Pilkington's death, but on his first preferment to it ; the French having then newly-landed some forces in Scotland, which put the queen upon a necessity of doubling her guards and increasing her garrisons. But, whatsoever was the cause of imposing this great yearly payment upon that bishopric, certain I am that it continued, and the money was duly paid into the Exchequer for many years, after the true cause thereof was taken away ; the queen's displeasure against Pilkington ending either with his life or hers, and all the garrisons and forces upon the Borders being taken away in the beginning of the reign of king James. So true is that old saying, *Quod Christus non capit, fiscus rapit* ; never more fully verified than in this particular.

FULLER.—I have given-in a double account of bishop Pilkington's issue and estate.

1. As fame reported, and as envious courtiers represented it to queen Elizabeth, that he gave ten thousand with his only daughter. (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 129.)

2. As it was in truth, giving but four thousand a-piece with two daughters. (*Idem*, p. 513.)

The Animadvertor may allow me knowing in his family, my wife being grandchild to his eldest daughter, married to sir Henry Harrington.\*

Yet no relation to him, or favour for him as a semi-nonconformist, but mere love to the truth, made me entitle him "Doctor ;" though I confess bishop Godwin maketh him but Bachelor in Divi-

\* So is his name in my corrected books.

nity. For Dr. Caius, Master of Gonville Hall, whilst Pilkington was of St. John's in Cambridge, giveth him the style of Doctor,\* who must be presumed most exact in the titles of his own contemporary.

The difference is not great, betwixt taking away £1000 yearly from the bishopric, and charging it with an annual pension of £1000 to maintain the garrison of Berwick. However, if the reader can gain any information from what is additory in the *Animadverto*r, I shall be right glad thereof.

---

## BOOK VI.

### CONTAINING THE HISTORY OF ABBEYS.

125. DR. HEYLIN.—This book, containing the History of Abbeys, seems but a supplement to the former; but being made a distinct book by our author, we must do so likewise. In which the first thing capable of an animadversion, is but merely verbal; namely,

“Cistercians, so called from one Robert, living in Cistercium in Burgundy.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 146.) The place in Burgundy from whence these monks took denomination, though called Cistercium by the Latins, is better known to the French and English by the name Cisteaux; the monks thereof, “the monks of Cisteaux” by the English, and *les moines de Cisteaux* by the French; and yet our author hath hit it better in his Cistercians, than Ralph Brooke, York herald, did in his *sister-senses*; for which sufficiently derided by Augustine Vincent, as our author, being so well studied in heraldry, cannot choose but know.

FULLER.—It was equally in my power and pleasure, (without the least prejudice to the truth,) whether I would render the place in the French, (Cisteaux,) or retain the Latin name *Cistercium*. I preferred the latter, because our English word Cistercians hath most conformity therewith.

What is Ralph Brooke's sister-senses, brother-senses, or non-senses to me? This spends time in writing, money in buying, pains in reading, makes some more angry, none more knowing. Our author proceeds:—

126. DR. HEYLIN.—“But be he who he himself or any other pleaseth,—brother, if they will, to St. George on horseback.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 148.) Our author, not satisfying himself in that Equitius, who is supposed to be the first founder of monks in England, makes him in scorn to be the “brother of St. George on horseback;” that is

\* In his list of the Masters of St. John's.

to say, a mere chimera, a legendary saint, a thing of nothing. The knights of that most noble Order are beholding to him for putting their patron in the same rank with St. Equitius; of whose existence on the earth he can find no *constat*.

FULLER.—I honour the knights of that noble Order, as much as the Animadvertor himself. Their ribands (though now wearing out apace) seem in my eyes as fair and fresh as when first put on. I do not deny, but much doubt of St. George, as he is presented with his improbable achievements; yet grant the whole history only emblematical, and allegorical of Christ, rescuing his church from the might and malice of Satan; no diminution of honour at all is thereby to the Fellows of that noble Order.

DR. HEYLIN.—But I would have him know, how poorly soever he thinks of “St. George on horseback,” that there hath more been said of him, his noble birth, achievements, with his death and martyrdom, than all the friends our author hath will or can justly say in defence of our present “History.”

FULLER.—The Animadvertor might have done well to instance in that author which hath been the champion for this champion, and hath so substantially asserted him. If in this passage he reflecteth on his own book on that subject, he hath looked so long on St. George, he hath forgot Solomon: “Let another praise thee, and not thy own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips.” For my part, I am yet to seek what service he hath done to the church of God, so busy to make “down sabbath, and up St. George.” Our author proceeds:—

127. DR. HEYLIN.—“So they deserve some commendation for their orthodox judgment in maintaining some controversies in divinity of importance against the Jesuits.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 152.) Our author speaks this of the Dominicans or Preaching Friars, who, though they be the sole active managers of the Inquisition, deserve, notwithstanding, to be commended for “their orthodox judgment.” How so? Because, forsooth, in “some controversies of importance,”—that is to say, predestination, grace, free-will, and the rest of that link,—they hold the same opinions against the Jesuits and Franciscans, as the rigid Lutherans do against the Melanchthonians, and the rigid or peremptory Calvinists against the Remonstrants. As powerful as the Jesuits and Franciscans are in the court of Rome, they could never get the pope to declare so much in favour of their opinion, as here our author (out of pure zeal to the good cause) declares in favour of the Dominicans. It was wont to be the property or commendation of charity, that it “hoped all things, believed all things, thought no evil,” and, in a word, “covered a multitude of sins.” But zeal to the good cause, having eaten up charity, so far ascribes unto itself the true

qualities of it, as to pass over the sins and vices of such who have engaged themselves in defence thereof. And he that favours the good cause, though otherwise heterodox in doctrine, irregular in his conversation, as bloody a butcher of the true protestants as these Preaching Friars, shall have his imperfections covered, his vices hidden under this disguise,—that he is “orthodox in judgment,” and a true professor. Otherwise the Dominicans had not found such favour from the hands of our author, who would have drawn as much blood into their cheeks with his pen, as they have drawn from many a true protestant by their persecutions.

FULLER.—Two things are considerable in the Dominicans.

First. Their cruelty in managing the Inquisition, which all must justly condemn. And I doubt not, but God, when he maketh inquisition for blood, will remember the bloody Inquisition.

Secondly. Their orthodoxness in many points, here reckoned up by the Animadvertor, which, in the judgment of many pious and learned divines, deserve just commendation. And if the Animadvertor dissent from them herein, sure I am, he will close with them in another controversy against the Franciscans, in maintaining that the virgin Mary was conceived in sin. For although all generations shall call her blessed; yet it followeth not thence, that she was without sin, seeing “blessed is he to whom God imputeth no sin.” In a word, the Dominicans are the least erroneous of all the monks and friars. Our author proceeds:—

128. DR. HEYLIN.—“We will conclude with their observation, (as an ominous presage of abbeyes’ ruin,) that there was scarce a great abbey in England, which, once at least, was not burnt down with lightning from heaven.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 194.) Our author may be as well out in this, as he hath been in many things else; it being an ordinary thing to ascribe that to lightning, or fire from heaven, which happened by the malice or carelessness of knaves on earth: of which I shall speak more hereafter, on occasion of the firing of St. Paul’s steeple in London. (*Idem.*, vol. ii. p. 467.)

FULLER.—If your author “be out,” he told you who were out with your author; yea, who led him out; namely, the following authors, being all of them authentical, and of the Romish persuasion, cited in the margent:—1. *Historia Gervasii*. 2. *Historia Ingulphi*. 3. *Chronicon Petroburg*. 4. *Chronicon Sancti Edmundi*. 5. *Malmesbury*. 6. *Hovedon*. 7. *Walter Coventry*. 8. *Fabian*.

These may be presumed utterly unlikely to be libel heaven for the actions of earth, or to entitle that “an accident of lightning,” which was voluntary from knavish incendiaries.

DR. HEYLIN.—Now only noting by the way, that “scarce any,” and “but thirteen,” (for our author names no more which were so con-

sumed,) hang not well together. If only "thirteen" were so burnt, (and sure our author would have named them, if they had been more,) he should have rather changed his style, and said that "of so many Religious Houses as suffered by the decays of time and the fury of the Danish wars, or the rage of accidental fires, scarce any of them had been stricken by the hand of heaven."

FULLER.—He might as well have said, that "the husbandman, who only showeth a sample, hath no more corn in his barn;" or "the draper who presenteth but a pattern, hath no more cloth in his shop."

I was unwilling to burden my book with the enumeration of them all; and the reader may take notice, of the thirteen named, nine were mitred abbeys, each πολλῶν ἀντάξις ἄλλων, "eminently worth many meaner" monasteries, whose names follow. 1. Canterbury. 2. Croyland. 3. Peterborough. 4. St. Mary's, York. 5. Edmondsbury. 6. Gloucester. 7. Chichester. 8. Glastonbury. 9. Evesham.

If it were worth the while, I could add many more; mean time, it is enough to say, Mr. Fox is the author wherein this is to be found. Our author proceeds:—

129. DR. HEYLIN.—"Hence presently arose the northern rebellion, wherein all the open undertakers were north of Trent," &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 212.) Not all "the open undertakers," I am sure of that; our author telling us in the words next following, that "this commotion began first in Lincolnshire," no part whereof, except the river-isle of Axholme, lies beyond the Trent. Concerning which we are instructed by John Stow, that "at an assize for the king's subsidy kept in Lincolnshire, the people made an insurrection, and gathered nigh twenty thousand persons, who took certain lords and gentlemen of the country, causing them to be sworn to them upon certain Articles which they had devised."\* For which rebellion, and some other practices against the state, twelve of that county, that is to say, five priests, and seven laymen, were not long after drawn to Tyburn, and there hanged and quartered.† By which we see, that all the open undertakers in the northern rebellion were not north of Trent, nor all the principal undertakers neither; some lords and gentlemen of that county (though against their wills) appearing in it, and amongst others sir John Hussey, created baron not long before by king Henry VIII. and shortly after punished by him with the loss of his head, for being one of the heads of this insurrection.‡

FULLER.—Almost all Lincolnshire lieth north (though not of the fall) of the foundation of Trent. However, these words,

\* Stow in Henry VIII. fol. 573.  
Lincolnshire, fol. 535.

† Idem. fol. 574.

‡ CAMDEN in

“north of Trent,” shall be altered into, “in the north of England.” Our author proceeds:—

DR. HEYLIN.—“Where there be many people, there will be many offenders; there being a Ham amongst the eight in the ark; yea, a Cain amongst the four primitive persons in the beginning of the world.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 218.) In this, our author’s rule is better than his exemplification. For though there were but eight persons in the ark, whereof Ham was one; yet in all probability there were more than four persons in the world at the birth of Abel, reckoning him for one. For though the Scripture doth subjoin the birth of Abel unto that of Cain, yet it was rather in relation to the following story, wherein Abel was a principal party, than that no other children had been born between them. The world had peopled very slowly, and never increased to such vast multitudes in so short a time, if Eve had not twinned at least at every birth, and that some other children had not intervened between Cain and Abel. Nor was Cain, in relation to the time of his brother’s birth, to be accounted of as Cain in our author’s sense, that is to say, a malefactor, an offender, a murderer of his innocent brother; or, if we take him in that sense, there must be then some scores of persons at the least, if not many hundreds, and, consequently, no such Cain amongst the four primitive persons in the beginning of the world, as our author would.

“Such who are prelatically affected, must acknowledge these new foundations of the king’s for a worthy work,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 252.) So then the foundation of six bishoprics, with the capitular bodies, schools, alms-houses, and other ministers and officers subservient to them, is to be thought “a worthy work” (with reference to the work itself) by none but “such as are prelatically affected.” The preferment of so many men of learning, the education of so many children, the maintenance of so many choirmen, the relief of so many decayed and impotent persons, the provision made for so many of all sorts, who had their being and subsistence in the said foundations, had nothing in it which might signify “a worthy work,” unless there be somewhat of a prelatical persuasion in them who put that value and esteem upon it. If any of a contrary judgment do approve the same, it is not to be attributed to the worth of the work, but to the accidental use which the unhappiness of this age hath put them to; that is to say, by selling all the lands which severally belonged unto them, to supply the present necessities of the commonwealth, as our author telleth us. Assuredly, such as are now founded in Colleges, or possessed of tithes, have good cause to thank him for this discourse; which, by this rule and reason, are to be approved of by none but those who are interested and concerned in them; except it be with reference to some subsequent sale, when the pretended exigencies of the commonwealth, or of any prevailing party in it, shall require the same.

FULLER.—I pass not whether there were, or were not; I build.

nothing of consequence thereon; and the matter being no more, I may take it by content without telling it, on the reputation of the general opinion. Our author proceeds:—

130. DR. HEYLIN.—“It was in those days conceived highly injurious, to thrust monks and nuns out of house and home, without assigning them any allowance for their subsistence.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 255.) Our author says very well in this, there being few religious persons thrust out of their houses, (except those that suffered by the first act of dissolution,) who either were not preferred in the church, (as Wakeman, the last abbot of Tewkesbury, was by the king made the first bishop of Gloucester,) or otherwise provided of some liberal pension, according to their age, wants, and quality; insomuch as sir William Weston, lord prior of the Order of St. John’s, had a yearly pension of a thousand pounds; Rawson, the subprior, of a thousand marks; some of the brethren, of two hundred pounds *per annum*; and thirty pounds *per annum* he that had least. Nor did the king only give them such competent pensions as might yield them a subsistence for the future, but furnished them with ready money beforehand, (their *viaticum* or advance-money as it were,) toward their setting-up in the world, which commonly amounted to a fourth part of their yearly pension. The like honest care to which I find in our author’s “History of Waltham-Abbey,” (page 261,) where he telleth us, that the Canons founded there by king Harold were not removed thence by king Henry II. (notwithstanding the scandalous conversation which was charged upon them,) and Augustinian Friars brought into their place, *donec prædictis Canonicis sufficienter provisum fuisset*, “till the said Canons were other ways provided of sufficient maintenance.” And this may serve for the instruction (I will not say the reproach) of the present times, in which so many bishops, deans, and prebendaries, no way obnoxious to any such scandalous accusations, have been thrust out of their cathedrals without the allowance of one penny towards their subsistence. The like may be said also in the case of the sequestered clergy. For though, by an Order of the House of Commons, their wives and children were to enjoy a fifth part of the yearly profits of their benefices, yet the unconscionable intruders found so many shifts to evade that order, that very few enjoyed the just benefit of it; and they that did, found their attendance on “the Committee for plundered Ministers” so troublesome and chargeable to them, that it did hardly quit the cost. One man I know particularly, who, after above twenty orders *pro* and *con*, and the riding of above a thousand miles backward and forward, besides a chargeable stay in London to attend the business, was fain at last to make a private agreement with the adverse party, and take a tenth part instead of a fifth. The like may be said also of the late Bill, by which the Presbyterian intruders are settled in the benefices of the sequestered clergy for term of life. For though it be thereby provided, that the commissioners “for rejecting of scanda-



lous ministers" shall have power to grant a fifth part, together with the arrears thereof, to the sequestered and ejected clergy; yet is the Bill clogged with two such circumstances, as make it altogether unuseful to some, and may make it little beneficial unto all the rest. For by the First it is declared, that no man shall receive any benefit by it, who hath either thirty pounds *per annum* in *real*, or five hundred pounds in *personal* estate; by means whereof many who have had some hundreds of pounds yearly to maintain their families, are tied up to so poor a pittance as will hardly keep their children from begging in the open streets. By the other, there is such a power given to the Commissioners, that, "not exceeding the fifth part," they may give to the poor sequestered clergy as much and as little as they please, under that proportion. And one I know particularly in this case also, who for an arrear of twelve years out of a benefice rented formerly at £250 *per annum*, to my certain knowledge could obtain but £3. 6s. 8d. (the first intruder being still living, and possessed of that benefice,) and no more than twenty marks *per annum* for his future subsistence; which is but a nineteenth part, instead of a fifth. And this I have observed the rather, that if these papers should chance to come into the hands of any of those who have the conduct of affairs, they would be pleased to cause the said Bill to be reviewed, and make the benefit thereof more certain and extensive than it is at the present. Our author might have saved me the greatest part of this application, had he been minded to do the poor clergy any right, as he seldom doth. For proof whereof we need but look upon a passage in this very book, (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 169,) which is this that followeth:—"Once," saith he, "it was in my mind to set down a catalogue (easy to do, and useful when done) of such houses of Cistercians, Templars, and Hospitallers, which were founded since the Lateran Council, yet going under the general notion of tithe-free, to the great injury of the church. But since, on second thoughts, I conceived it better to let it alone, as not sure, on such discovery, of any blessing from such ministers which should gain, but certain of many curses from such laymen who should lose, thereby." So he. But I have heard it for a usual saying of king Henry IV. of France, that "he who feared the pope's curse, the reproaches of discontented people, and the frowns of his mistress, should never sleep a quiet hour in his bed." And so much for that.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor, going along with me in this long note, needeth no answer of mine. Hereupon he taketh occasion to show how injuriously many sequestered clergymen are dealt with in their fifth part; that, instead thereof, but a nineteenth part is paid in some places; and I am sorry I must concur with him in so sad a truth.

But whereas, after his too just complaint, he concludeth with this passage:—"Our author might have saved me the greatest part of this application, had he been minded to do the poor clergy any right,

as he seldom doth : ” let me add, “ The Animadvertor might have saved me all the pains of this answer, had he not been minded causelessly to cavil, as he often doth. ” For when I handled the subject of the fifth part, First, I got the order for it, (hard to come by,) to be inserted. Secondly. I solemnly answered seven subterfuges, pretended by such as either wholly refuse, or defectively pay, the fifth part to the sequestered minister, and thus conclude :—

“ I am sorry to see the pitiful and pious intentions of the Parliament so abused and deluded by the indirect dealings of others ; so that they cannot attain their intended ends, for the relief of so many poor people, seeing, no doubt, therein they desired to be like the Best of Beings, who as closely applieth his lenitive as corrosive plasters, and that his mercy may take as true effect as his justice. Sure, if the present authority (when at leisure from higher employment) shall be pleased to take the groans of these poor souls into its consideration, the voice of their hungry bowels will quickly be turned to a more pleasant tune, from barking for food, to the blessing of those who procured it. Nor let any censure this a digression from my History ; for though my estate will not suffer me, with Job, to be ‘ eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame, ’ (Job xxix. 15,) I will endeavour what I can to be a tongue for the dumb. ” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 492, 493.)

Let the reader judge betwixt me and the Animadvertor, whether, in this particular matter controverted, I have not done the poor clergy as much right as lay in my power, and more than consisted with my safety. Our author proceeds :—

131. DR. HEYLIN.—“ But this was done without any great cost to the crown, only by altering the property of the place from a late-made cathedral to an abbey. ” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 278.) Our author speaks this of the church of Westminster ; which though it suffered many changes, yet had it no such change as our author speaks of ; that is to say, from a cathedral to an abbey, without any other alteration which came in between. For when the monastery was dissolved by king Henry VIII. *anno* 1539, it was made a deanery, William Benson being the first dean. In the year 1541, he made it an episcopal see, or cathedral church, and placed Thomas Thurlby the first bishop there. But Thurlby being removed to Norwich, *anno* 1550, the bishopric was suppressed by king Edward VI. and the church ceased from being cathedral, continuing as a deanery only till the 21st of November, 1557 ; at what time Dr. Hugh Weston, the then dean thereof, unwillingly removed to Windsor, made room for Feckenham and his monks, and so restored it once again to the state of an abbey, as our author telleth us.

FULLER.—I said not, that it was immediately changed from a

cathedral to an abbey ; but that it was changed, and that without any great cost to the crown ; so my words want nothing but a candid reader of them. Our author proceeds :—

132, 133. DR. HEYLIN.—“Nor can I find, in the first year of queen Elizabeth, any particular statute wherein (as in the reign of king Henry VIII.) these Orders are *nominatim* suppressed,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 281.) But, First, the several Orders of Religious Persons were not “suppressed *nominatim*,” except that of St. John’s, by a statute in the time of king Henry VIII. Secondly. If there were no such statute, yet was it not because those Houses “had no legal settlement,” as it after followeth ; queen Mary being vested with a power of granting mortmains, and consequently of founding these Religious Houses in a legal way. Thirdly. There might be such a statute, though our author never had the good luck to see it ; and yet, for want of such good luck, I find him apt enough to think there was no such statute. *Et quod non invenit usquam, esse putat nusquam*, in the poet’s language. And such a statute as he speaks of there was indeed, mentioned and related to in the charter of queen Elizabeth for founding the collegiate church of St. Peter in Westminster. But being an unprinted statute, and of private use, it easily might escape our author’s diligence, though it did not Camden’s ; who, being either better-sighted, or more concerned, had a view thereof. For, telling us how the monks with their abbot had been set in possession again by queen Mary, he after addeth, that “they within a while after being cast out by authority of Parliament, the most virtuous queen Elizabeth converted it into a collegiate church, or rather into a seminary or nurse-garden of the church,” &c.\*

FULLER.—I could not then find the statute, and I am not ashamed to confess it. Let those be censured who pretend to have found what they have not, and so by their confidence (or impudence rather) abuse posterity. Since, I have found a copy thereof in sir Thomas Cotton’s library, with many commissions granted thereupon, for the dissolution of such Marian foundations. Our author proceeds :—

134. DR. HEYLIN.—“Jesuits, the last and newest of all Orders.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 288.) The *newest*, if the *last*, there is no doubt of that : but “the last” they were not, the Oratorians (as they call them) being of a later brood ; the Jesuits, founded by Ignatius Loyola, a Spaniard, and confirmed by pope Paul III. *anno* 1540 ; the Oratorians founded by Philip Merio, a Florentine, and confirmed by pope Pius IV. *anno* 1564. By which account these Oratorians are younger brethren to the Jesuits, by the space of four and twenty years ; and consequently the Jesuits not “the last and newest of Religious Orders.”

\* CAMDEN in Middlesex, fol. 429.

FULLER.—Writing the “Church History of Britain,” I herein confined my expression thereunto. The Jesuits are “the last and newest Order,” whose over-activity in our land commends (or condemns them rather) to public notice.

*Idem est non esse, et non apparere.* The Oratorians never appeared in England, save an handful of them, who, at queen Mary’s \* first arrival from France, only came hither, to go hence a few months after.

---

## BOOK VII.

CONTAINING THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD VI.

135. DR. HEYLIN.—We are now come unto the reign of king Edward VI. which our author passeth lightly over, though very full of action and great alterations. And here the first thing which I meet with, is an unnecessary query which he makes about the Injunctions of this king ; amongst which we find one concerning the religious keeping of the holy-days, in the close whereof it is declared, “That it shall be lawful for all people, in time of harvest, to labour upon holy and festival days, and save that thing which God hath sent ; and that scrupulosity to abstain from working on those days doth grievously offend God.” Our author hereupon makes this query, that is to say, “Whether in the twenty-fourth Injunction, *labouring in time of harvest upon holy-days and festivals*, relateth not only to those of ecclesiastical constitution, (as dedicated to saints,) or be inclusive of the Lord’s-day also ?” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 309.) Were not our author a great zealot for the Lord’s-day sabbath, and studious to entitle it to some antiquity, we had not met with such a query. The law and practice of those times make this plain enough. For in the statute of 5 and 6 of Edward VI. cap. 3, the names and number of the holy-days being first laid down, that is to say, “all Sundays in the year, the feasts of the Circumcision of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Epiphany,” &c. with all the rest still kept, and there named particularly, it is thus enacted, namely, “That it shall and may be lawful to every husbandman, labourer, fisherman, and to all and every other person and persons of what estate, degree, or condition he or they be, upon the holy-days aforesaid in harvest, or at any other times in the year, *when necessity shall so require*, to labour, ride, fish, or work any kind of work, at their free wills and pleasure: any thing in this Act to the contrary notwithstanding.” The law being such, there is no question to be made in point of practice, nor consequently of the meaning of the king’s

\* Henrietta Maria, the queen of Charles I.—EDIT.

Injunction. For further opening of which truth, we find in sir John Haywood's History of this king, that not the country only, but the court were indulged the liberty of attending business on that day; it being ordered by the king, amongst other things, "that the Lords of the Council should upon Sundays attend the public affairs of the realm, dispatch answers to letters for good order of the State, and make full dispatches of all things concluded the week before; provided that they be present at Common-Prayer. And that on every Sunday night the king's Secretary should deliver him a memorial of such things as are to be debated by the privy council in the week ensuing." \* Which orders had our author read and compared with the statute, he had not needed to have made this query about the true intent and meaning of the king's Injunction.

FULLER.—It is better to be over-doubtful, than over-confident. It had been much for the credit, and nothing against the conscience, of the Animadvertor, if he had made queries, where he so positively and falsely hath concluded against me. Now my query is answered; and I believe that the Lord's day was included within the number of holy-days, and common work permitted thereon.

This maketh me bespeak my own and the reader's (justly suspecting that the Animadvertor will not join with us herein on this account) thankfulness to God, that the Reformation since the time of king Edward VI. hath been progressive, and more perfected, in this point amongst the rest, in securing the Lord's day from servile employments. Our author proceeds:—

136. DR. HEYLIN.—“In the first year of king Edward VI. it was recommended to the care of the most grave bishops, and others, (assembled by the king at his Castle at Windsor,) and when by them completed, set forth in print, 1548, with a proclamation in the king's name, to give authority thereunto, being also recommended unto every bishop by especial letters from the Lords of the Council to see the same put in execution. And in the next year a penalty was imposed by Act of Parliament on such who should deprave or neglect the use thereof.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 312.) Our author here mistakes himself, and confounds the business; making no difference between the whole first Liturgy of king Edward VI. and a particular form of administration. For the better understanding whereof, he may please to know, that in the first Parliament of this king there passed a statute, (1 Edward VI. cap. 1,) entituled, “An Act against such as speak against the sacrament of the altar; and for the receipt thereof in both kinds.” Upon the coming out whereof, “the king, being no less desirous,” as Fox relates it, “to have the form of administration of the sacrament reduced to the right rule of the Scriptures, and first use of the primitive church, than he was to establish the same by authority of his own regal laws, appointed cer-

\* Hist. Edward VI. p. 353.

tain of the most grave and learned bishops and others of his realm to assemble together at his Castle of Windsor, there to argue and entreat of this matter, and conclude upon and set forth one perfect and uniform order, according to the rule and use aforesaid; which book was printed and set out March 8th, 1548," (which is 1547, according to the account of the church of England,) "with a proclamation of the king's before, as by the book itself appeareth." (Acts and Monuments, page 658.) But this book, thus set out and published, contained nothing but "a Form and Order of Administering the Holy Communion under both kinds," in pursuance of the statute before-mentioned; and served but as a preamble to the following Liturgy, a breakfast (as it were) to the feast ensuing. The Liturgy came not out till near two years after, confirmed in Parliament *anno* 2, 3 Edward VI. cap. i. and in that Parliament cried up as made by "the immediate aid and inspiration of the Holy Ghost." Which, notwithstanding some exceptions being taken at it, (as our author notes,) by Calvin abroad, and some zealots at home, the book was "brought under a review;" much altered in all the parts and offices of it, but whether unto the better, or unto the worse, let some others judge.

FULLER.—If the reader, by perusing this note of the Animadvertor, can methodize the confusion charged on me, I shall be right glad thereof; and I wish that the nice distinction of the *Liturgy*, and *the Form of Administration*, may be informative unto him, more than it is to me.

The close of this Animadversion,—“whether this book brought under a review, much altered in all the parts and offices of it, be unto the better or unto the worse,”—leaves it under a strong suspicion of the negative in the judgment of the Animadvertor.

And now I shall wonder no more at the Animadvertor's falling foul on my book, who (as he confesseth \*) am “not known unto him by any injury.” Seeing such distance in our judgments, that he conceiveth the Reformation in the reign of king Edward more perfect than what was afterwards, “let us make us a captain and return unto Egypt.” (Numbers xiv. 4.) I have too much advantage in my own hand, and a principle in my bosom will not give me leave to make use thereof to the utmost. Our author proceeds:—

137—140. DR. HEYLIN.—“At last the great earl of Warwick deserted his chaplain in open field to shift for himself. Indeed, he had higher things in his head, than to attend such trifles.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 333.) A man may easily discern a cat by her claw; and we may find as easily, by the scratches of our author's pen, to what party in the church he stands most inclined. He had before declared for the Dominicans and Rigid Calvinists in some points of doctrine, and now declares himself for the Nonconformists in point of ceremony. He

\* In his Introduction, p. 349.

had not else called the episcopal ornaments, particularly the rochet, chimere, and square-cap, by the name of "trifles;" such trifles as were not worth the contending for, if resolute Ridley had been pleased to dispense therein. The truth is, that Hooper's opposition in this particular gave the first ground to those combustions in the church which after followed; Calvin extremely stickling for him, and writing to his party here to assist him in it. And this I take to be the reason why our author is so favourable in his censure of him, page 330, and puts such answers in the mouths of the Nonconformist, page 332, as I can hardly think were so well hammered and accommodated in those early days; such as seem rather fitted for the temper and acumen of the present times, after a long debating of all particulars and a strict search into all the niceties of the controversy, than to the first beginnings and unpremeditated agitations of a new-born quarrel.

"Yet this work met afterwards with some frowns even in the faces of great clergymen, &c. because they conceived these singing-psalms erected in corrivality and opposition to the reading-psalms, which were formerly sung in cathedral churches." (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 336.) And those "great churchmen" had good reason for what they did, wisely foreseeing that the singing of those psalms so translated in rhythm and metre would work some alteration in the executing of the public Liturgy. For, First, though it be expressed in the title of those singing-psalms, that they were "set forth and allowed to be sung in all churches before and after Morning and Evening Prayer; and also before and after sermons;" yet this allowance seems rather to have been a connivance than an approbation: no such allowance being any where found by such as have been most industrious and concerned in the search thereof. Secondly. Whereas it was intended that the said psalms should be only sung "before and after Morning and Evening Prayer; and also before and after sermons," (which shows they were not to be intermingled in the public Liturgy,) in very little time they prevailed so far in most parish churches, as to thrust the *Te Deum*, the *Benedictus*, the *Magnificat*, and the *Nunc dimittis*, quite out of the church. And, Thirdly, by the practices and endeavours of the Puritan party, they came to be esteemed the most divine part of God's public service; the reading-psalms together with the first and second lessons being heard in many places with a covered head, but all men sitting bareheaded when the psalm is sung. And to that end, the parish clerk must be taught when he names the psalm, to call upon the people to sing it "to the praise and glory of God," no such preparatory exhortation being used at the naming of the chapters or the daily psalms. But whereas our author seems to intimate that the reading-psalms were formerly sung only in cathedral churches, he is exceedingly mistaken both in the Rubrics of the church, and the practice too; *the Rubrics* leaving them indifferently "to be said or sung," according as the congregation was fitted for it; *the practice* in some parish churches, within the time of my memory, being for it



also. And this our author (as I think) cannot choose but know, if he be but as well studied in the rules of the church, as in some popish legends and old ends of poetry.

“Let Adonijah and this lord’s example deter subjects from meddling with the widows of their sovereigns, lest in the same match they espouse their own danger and destruction.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 338.) I see little reason for this rule, less for his examples. For, First, Abishag the Shunamite, whom Adonijah desired to have to wife, was never married unto David; and therefore cannot properly be called “his widow.” And, Secondly, queen Catherine Parr, the widow of king Henry VIII. and wife unto sir Thomas Seymour, (the lord here mentioned,) is generally charactered for a lady of so meek a nature, as not to contribute any thing towards his destruction. Had the duchess of Somerset been less imperious than she was, or possessed but of one half of that equanimity which carried queen Catherine off in all times of her troubles, this lord might have lived happily in the arms of his lady, and gone in peace unto the grave. We find the like match to have been made between another Catherine, the widow of another Henry, and Owen Tudor, a private gentleman of Wales, prosperous and comfortable to them both; though Owen was inferior to sir Thomas Seymour both in birth and quality, and Catherine of Valois, daughter to Charles VI. of France, far more superior in her blood to queen Catherine Parr. The like may be said also of the marriage of Adeliza, daughter of Geoffrey, earl of Louvain and duke of Brabant, and widow to king Henry I., married to William de Albene, a noble gentleman, to whom she brought the castle and honour of Arundel, conferred upon her by the king her former husband, continuing in the possession of their posterity, though in several families, to this very day; derived by the heirs-general from this house of Albany to that of the Fitz-Alans, and from them to the Howards, the now earls thereof. Many more examples of which kind, fortunate and successful to each party, might be easily found, were it worth the while.

FULLER.—I say not that they were trifles, but that John Dudley, earl of Warwick, (afterwards duke of Northumberland,) counted them so, in respect to his high designs to the crown. Yea, it is more than suspicious, that his ambition esteemed greater matters than ceremonies, “mere trifles,” even religion itself, which he so often changed.

“If the cat hath put in her claw, let her put in her whole foot. I conceive such vestments comparatively trifles, as to things necessary to salvation. And thus I prove it:—

I dare wager with the Animadvertor, that, take the clergy of England, as constituted 1640, three parts of four did not know what a *chimere* was. Nor is this any diminution to their learning and religion; seeing they were not bound to take cognizance thereof. And therefore I believe one may safely call it “a trifle,” without

the knowledge of which word, and what was meant thereby, so many flocks of pious and learned shepherds have gone to heaven.

As for the Animadvertor's additory note which followeth, concerning the singing of psalms in churches, I am not concerned therein.

Nor will I here insert his instances of some fortunate subjects, who married queens, seeing I say not ALWAYS, but "*often*, such matches prove unprosperous." Our author proceeds :—

141, 142. DR. HEYLIN.—“ This barren Convocation is entituled ‘ the parent of those articles of religion,’ (forty-two in number,) which are printed with this preface: *Articuli de quibus in Synodo Londinensi,*” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 353.) Our author here is guilty of a greater crime, than that of *scandalum magnatum*, making king Edward VI. of pious memory, no better than an impious and lewd impostor. For if the Convocation of this year were barren, (as he saith it was,) it could neither be the parent of those Articles, nor of the short Catechism which was printed with them, countenanced by the king's letters patents prefixed before it. For, First, the title to the Articles runneth thus at large, namely, *Articuli de quibus in Synodo Londinensi, anno 1552, inter episcopos et alios eruditos viros convenerat, ad tollendam opinionum dissensionem, et consensum veræ religionis firmandum, regiâ auctoritate in lucem editi.* Which title none durst have adventured to set before them, had they not really been the products of that Convocation.

Secondly. The king had no reason to have any such “ jealousy ” at that time of “ the major part of the clergy,” but that he might “ trust them with a power to meddle with matters of religion ;” (which is the only argument our author bringeth against those Articles ;) this Convocation being holden in the sixth year of his reign, when most of the episcopal sees and parochial churches were filled with men agreeable to his desires, and generally conformable to the form of worship then by law established.

Thirdly. The church of England, for the first five years of queen Elizabeth, retained these Articles, and no other, as the public tendries of the church in points of doctrine ; which certainly she had not done, had they been recommended to her by a less authority than a Convocation.

Fourthly and Lastly. We have the testimony of our author against himself ; who, telling us of the catechism above-mentioned, that it was of the same extraction with the Book of Articles, adds afterwards, that, “ being first composed by a single person it was *perused and allowed by the bishops and other learned men*, (understand it *the Convocation*,) and by royal authority commended to all subjects, and commanded to all schoolmasters to teach it their scholars.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 354.) So that this Catechism being allowed by the bishops

and other learned men in the Convocation, and the Articles being said to be "of the same extraction;" it must needs follow thereupon, that these Articles had no other parent than this Convocation. The truth is, that the records of Convocation, during this king's whole reign, and the first years of queen Mary, are very imperfect and defective; most of them lost, and amongst others those of this present year; and yet one might conclude as strongly that my mother died childless, because my christening is not to be found in the parish register; as that the Convocation of this year was barren, because the Acts and Articles of it are not entered in the journal-book.

FULLER.—Here is an high charge indeed. I believe that I am generally believed to have as high a reverence for the memory of king Edward as the Animadvertor himself.

The Journals of the Convocation in this king's reign I have carefully perused, which are no better than blank paper, containing only the names of the members therein daily meeting, without any matter of moment (yea, any matter at all) registered to be performed by them. But I wholly refer myself to what I have written in my "Church-History" of this hard subject, making it there as plain as I could; which the Animadvertor hath a mind again to involve and perplex.

---

## BOOK VIII.

### THE REIGN OF QUEEN MARY.

143. DR. HEYLIN.—We next proceed unto the short but troublesome reign of queen Mary; in which the first thing that occurs, is, "But the Commons of England, who, for many years together, had conned loyalty by heart out of the Statute of the Succession, were so perfect in their lesson, that they would not be put out of it by this new-started design." (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 368.) In which I am to note these things: First. That he makes the loyalty of the Commons of England not to depend upon the primogeniture of their princes, but on the Statute of Succession; and then the object of that loyalty must not be the king, but the Act of Parliament, by which they were directed to the knowledge of the next successor: and then it must needs be in the power of Parliaments to dispose of the kingdom as they pleased; the people's loyalty being tied to such dispositions. Secondly. That the Statutes of Succession had been so many, and so contrary to one another, that the common people could not readily tell which to trust to; and for the last, it related to the king's last Will and Testament, so lately made and known unto so few of the Commons, that they had neither opportunity to see it, nor time to con the same by heart. Nor, Thirdly, were the Commons so per-

fect in this lesson of loyalty, or had so fixed it in their hearts, but that they were willing to forget it within little time, and take out such new lessons of disobedience and disloyalty, as Wyat and his partisans did preach unto them. And, Finally, they had not so well conned this lesson of loyalty, in our author's own judgment, but that some strong pretender might have taught them a new art of oblivion: it being no improbable thing (as himself confesseth) "to have heard of a king Henry IX. if Henry Fitz-Roy, the duke of Somerset and Richmond, had lived so long as to the death of king Edward VI."

FULLER.—I make not the loyalty of the Commons to depend on, but to be directed by, the Statute of Succession.

In such intricacies, it was good to have such a guide to lead men's judgments in the right. And though some malcontents started from their loyalty, the generality of the Commons of England kept constant unto it. Our author proceeds:—

144—146. DR. HEYLIN.—"Afterwards Philpot was troubled by Gardiner for his words spoken in the Convocation. In vain did he plead the privilege of the place, commonly reputed a part of Parliament." (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 384.) I cannot find that the Convocation at this time, nor many years before this time, was commonly reputed as a part of the Parliament. That anciently it had been so, I shall easily grant; there being a clause in every letter of summons by which the bishops were required to attend in Parliament, that they should warn the clergy of their several and respective diocesses, some in their persons, and others by their procurators, to attend there also. But this hath been so long unpractised, that we find no track or footsteps of it since the Parliaments of the time of king Richard II. It is true, indeed, that in the eighth year of king Henry VI. there passed a statute by which it was enacted, "That all the clergy which should be called thenceforth to the Convocation by the king's writ, together with their servants and families, should for ever after fully use and enjoy such liberty or immunity in coming, tarrying, and returning, as the great men and commonalty of the realm of England, called or to be called to the king's Parliament, have used or ought to have or enjoy."\* Which though it make the Convocation equal to the Parliament, as to the freedom of their persons; yet can it not from hence be reckoned, and much less "commonly reputed," for a part thereof.

"Indeed the queen bare Pole an unfeigned affection; and no wonder to him that considereth, 1. Their age; he being about ten years older,—the proportion allowed by the philosopher betwixt husband and wife," &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 388.) In queen Mary's affection unto Pole, and the reasons of it, I am very well satisfied, better than in the explication which he adds unto it. For if by "the philosopher"

\* RASIAL'S "Abridgment," fol. 423.

he means Aristotle, as I think he doth, he is very much out in making no more than ten years to be the proportion allowed by him betwixt the husband and the wife. For Aristotle, in the seventh book of his Politics, having discoursed of the fittest time and age for marriage both in men and women, concludes at last, that "it is expedient that maidens be married about the age of eighteen years, and men at seven and thirty, or thereabouts." His reason is, Ἐν τοσούτῳ γὰρ ἀκμάζουσι τε τοῖς σώμασι σύζευξις ἔσται, καὶ πρὸς τὴν παῦλαν τῆς τεκνοποιίας συγκαταβήσεται τοῖς χρόνοις εὐκαίρως that is to say, "Because they shall then be joined in wedlock, while their bodies be in full strength, and shall cease from procreation in fit time."\* Whether so great a disproportion were allowed of then, or that it was a matter of speculation only, and not reducible to practice, I dispute not now. Only I note that it is *twenty* years, not *ten*, which the philosopher requires in the different ages of the man and wife.

"Lincoln diocess, the largest of the whole kingdom, containing Leicester, &c. with parts of Hertford and Warwick shires." (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 395.) That the great diocess of Lincoln containeth the whole counties of Bedford, Buckingham, Huntingdon, Leicester, and Lincoln, with part of Hertfordshire, is confessed by all; but that it containeth also some part of Warwickshire, I do very much doubt. Certain I am, that archbishop Parker,† a man very well skilled in the jurisdiction of his suffragan bishops, assigns no part of Warwickshire to the see of Lincoln; dividing that county between the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, and the bishop of Worcester. I see by this, our author is resolved to play at all games, though he get by none.

FULLER.—I only say, that Mr. Philpot pleaded it, (and that in vain,) that it was so reputed, as may plainly appear in Mr. Fox; so that my words are liable to no just exception. Our author proceeds:—

147. DR. HEYLIN.—"The Litany, surplice, and other ceremonies in service and sacraments, they omitted, both as *superfluous and superstitious*." (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 407.) Our author speaks this of the schismatical congregation at Frankfort, who turned the public Church-Liturgy quite out of their church, fashioning to themselves a new form of worship, which had no warrant and foundation by the laws of this realm. And, First, saith he, "the Litany, surplice, and other ceremonies, they omitted, both as superfluous and superstitious." *Superfluous and superstitious*,—in whose opinion? In that of the schismatics at Frankfort, our author's, or in both alike? Most probable in our author's, as well as theirs; for, otherwise, he would have added some note of qualification, such as, "they thought, they judged, or they supposed them:" according as he hath restrained them to their own sense in the clause next following, namely, "In place of the

\* ARISTOTLE, Pol. l. vii. cap. 16.

† *Antiquit. Britan.*

English Confession, they used another, adjudged by them of more effect." *Adjudged by them* in this, not the former sentence, makes me inclinable to believe that the Litany, surplice, and other ceremonies are both "superfluous and superstitious" in our author's judgment, not in theirs alone. Secondly. Our author (as we have noted formerly on the second book of this History) reckons the cross in baptism, used and required to be used by the church of England, among "the superstitious ceremonies and such like trinkets with which that sacrament is loaded." And if he durst declare himself so plain in this second book, written, as he affirms, in the reign of the late king, when he might fear to be called to an account for that expression, there is little question to be made but "since Monarchy was turned into a State," he would give his pen more liberty than he did before, in counting "the Litany, surplice, and other ceremonies as superfluous and superstitious," as the cross in baptism.

FULLER.—This note might well have been spared. I appeal to such as knew my conformity in the College chapel, country parishes, and cathedral of Sarum, to be my compurgators in this unjust accusation.

148. DR. HEYLIN.—Thirdly. Having laid down an abstract of the form of worship contrived by the schismatics at Frankfort, he honour-eth them with no lower title than that of "saints;" and counts this liberty of deviating from the rules of the church for a part of their happiness. For so it followeth: "This," saith he, "is *the communion of saints*, who never account themselves peaceably possessed of any happiness, until (if it be in their power) they have also made their fellow-sufferers partakers thereof." (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 408.) If those be "saints" who separate themselves schismatically from their mother-church; and if it be a happiness to them to be permitted so to do; our author hath all the reason in the world to desire to be admitted into their communion, and be made partaker of that happiness which such saints enjoy. And if, in order thereunto, he counts "the Litany, surplice, and other ceremonies of the church to be both superstitious and superfluous" too, who can blame him for it?

FULLER.—If God were not more merciful unto us, than we are charitable one to another, what would become of us all?

I humbly conceive that these exiles (though I will not advocate for their carriage in all particulars) had more liberty in modelling their own church, than such as live in England, under a settled government, commanded by authority. "Schismatic," in my mind, is too harsh for such who fled and suffered for their conscience. However, I conceive a saintship not inconsistent with such schismaticalness; God graciously, on their general repentance, forgiving them their fault herein. Our author proceeds:—

149. DR. HEYLIN.—"Trinity College built by sir Thomas Pope."



(Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 426.) I shall not derogate so much from sir Thomas Pope, as our author doth from Trinity College, naming no bishop of this House, as he doth of others. He tells us that he lived in this University about seventeen weeks ; and all that time Dr. Skinner, the bishop of Oxford, lived there too. Dr. Wright, the bishop of Lichfield, probably was then living also, (for he deceased not till after the beginning of the year 1643,) but living at that time in his own house of Ecclesal Castle. Both of them members of this College, and therefore worthily deserving to have found some place in our author's History. And because our author can find no learned writers of this College neither, I will supply him with two others in that kind also. The First whereof shall be John Selden, of the Inner Temple, ὁ περὶ πάντων πεπαιδευμένος, that renowned humanitian and philologer, sometimes a Commoner of this House, and here initiated in those studies in which he afterwards attained to so high an eminence. The Second, William Chillingworth, an able and acute divine, and once a Fellow of this College ; whose book intituled, "The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation," written in defence of Dr. Potter's book called "Charity mistaken," commended by our author, (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 424,) remains unanswered by the Jesuits, notwithstanding all their brags beforehand, to this very day. Which book, though most ridiculously buried with the author at Arundel, ("Get thee gone, thou accursed book," &c.) by Mr. Francis Cheynel, the usufructuary of the rich parsonage of Petworth, shall still survive unto the world in its own just value, when the poor three-penny commodities of such a sorry haberdasher of small wares shall be out of credit. Of this pageant, see the pamphlet called *Chillingworthi Novissima*, printed at London, anno 1644.

FULLER.—If the Animadvertor had written an History of Cambridge, perchance he would have made as many and great omissions. I have craved solemn pardon of the reader when such failings should occur.—

"I humbly request the antiquaries of their respective foundations, best skilled in their own worthy natives, to insert their own observations ; which if they would restore unto me against the next edition of this work, if it be thought worthy thereof, God shall have the glory, they the public thanks, and the world the benefit, of their contributions to my endeavours." (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 363.)

Bishop Wright is entered-in (where he ought) a Warden of Wadham ; the rest shall be inserted in the next edition, with my worthy friend Mr. Gilbert Ironside of the same foundation.

Mr. Cheynel is now rather the object of the Animadvertor's prayer and pity, than of his anger.\* Our author proceeds :—

\* Though Heylin's vituperative expressions on this subject were, "speaking after the manner of men," not unmerited by the occasion ; yet every true Christian must admire Fuller's characteristic inclination to "prayer and pity," especially on being informed,



150. DR. HEYLIN.—“But, now it\* is gone, let it go ; it was but a beggarly town, and cost England ten times yearly more than it was worth in keeping thereof.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 429.) Admit it be so, yet certainly it was worth the keeping, had it cost much more. The English, while they kept that town, had a door open into France upon all occasions ; and therefore it was commonly said that they carried the keys of France at their girdles. Sound statesmen do not measure the benefit of such towns and garrisons as are maintained and kept in an enemy’s country, by the profit which they bring into their Exchequer, but by the opportunities they give a prince to enlarge his territories. Of this kind was the town of Berwick, situate on the other side of the Tweed, upon Scottish ground ; but garrisoned and maintained with great charge by the king of England, because it gave him the same advantage against the Scots, as Calais did against the French. The government of which last town is by Comines said to be “the goodliest captainship in the world ;” so great an eye-sore to the French, that Monsieur de Cordes (who lived in the time of Lewis XI.) was used to say, that “he would be content to lie in hell seven years together, upon condition that Calais were regained from the English ;” and, finally, judged of such importance by the French, when they had regained it, that neither the agreement made at the treaty of Cambray, nor the desire to free Newhaven from the power of the English, nor the necessities which Henry IV. was reduced unto, could ever prevail upon them to part with it. But it is dry meat, said the country-fellow, when he lost the hare ; and so let Calais pass for “a beggarly town,” and “not worth the keeping,” because we have no hope to get it.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor might understand my meaning, even to make the best of a bad matter, when it cannot be helped.

A key falleth under a double valuation : one, for the intrinsical works, from the weight thereof in metal, which is very inconsiderable. The other, from the use thereof, and thus its price riseth or falleth, as it openeth to more or less treasure.

Calais, I confess, in the second consideration, was a place of main importance ; yet indeed it cost a vast expense in keeping it, as by a book in the Exchequer (which some months since I perused) doth appear ; the charge amounting to an innumerable sum,† at the rate of money in that age.

that, at the time when HEYLIN’S “Animadversions” were published, the headstrong but unfortunate Dr. Francis Cheynel was labouring under confirmed aberration of intellect. His conduct in many of those exciting scenes through which he had previously passed, exhibit strong traces of the same mental complaint, then not fully developed ; and it would be an act of the greatest uncharitableness, were the unseemly and disgusting behaviour of an individual at the funeral of the great Chillingworth to be imputed to the political party with whom he was connected, when every man will perceive that it was but one of the earlier indications of lurking insanity.—EDIT.

\* Calais. † In particulars, their total sum, to my remembrance, not being cast up.

## BOOK IX.

CONTAINING THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

151—153. DR. HEYLIN.—The short reigns of king Edward VI. and queen Mary being briefly passed over by our author, he spends the more time in setting-out the affairs of the church under queen Elizabeth; not so much because her reign was long, but because it was a busy age, and full of faction. To which faction how he stands affected, he is not coy to let us see on all occasions, giving us in the very first entrance this brief but notable essay; namely,—

“Idolatry is not to be permitted a moment; the first minute is the fittest to abolish it. All that have power have right to destroy it, by that grand charter of religion whereby every one is bound to advance God’s glory. And if sovereigns forget, no reason but subjects should remember their duty.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. pp. 438, 439.) Our author speaks this in behalf of some forward spirits, who, not enduring “the laziness of authority” in order to the great work of reformation, “fell beforehand to the beating-down of superstitious pictures and images.” And though some others condemned their indiscretion herein, yet our author will not, but rather gives these reasons for their justification: 1. That the popish religion is idolatry. 2. That idolatry is to be destroyed by all that have power to do it. 3. (Which is indeed the main,) That “if the sovereigns do forget, there is no reason but subjects should remember their duty.” This being our author’s masterpiece, and a fair groundwork for the seditious and rebellious for the times ensuing, I shall spend a little the more time in the examination of the propositions, as before we had them. And,

1. It will be hard for our author to prove that the Romish religion is idolatry; though possible it is, that some of the members of that church may be proved idolaters. I know well what great pains Dr. Reynolds took in his laborious work entituled, *De Idololatriâ Ecclesiæ Romanæ*; and I know too that many very learned and moderate men were not thoroughly satisfied in his proofs and arguments. That they are worshippers of images, as themselves deny not, so no body but themselves can approve them in it. But there is a very wide difference betwixt an image and an idol, betwixt the old idolaters in the state of Heathenism, and those which give religious worship unto images in some parts of Christendom. And this our author, being well studied in antiquity, and not a stranger to the controversies of the present times, cannot choose but know; though zeal to “the good cause,” and the desire of being constant to himself, drew this passage from him. The Christian faith delivered in the holy Gospels succeeded over the greatest part of the then known world, in the place of that idolatrous worship, which like a leprosy had generally overspread the

whole face thereof. And therefore that the whole mass of Wickliffe's heterodoxies might be christened by the name of "Gospel," our author thinks it necessary that the popish mass, and the rest of the superstitions of that church, should be called idolatry.

2. That idolatry is to be destroyed by all them that have power to do it, I shall easily grant. But then it must be understood of a lawful power, and not permitted to the liberty of unlawful violence. *Id possumus, quod jure possumus*, was the rule of old; and it held good in all attempts for reformation in the elder times. For when the fabric of the Jewish church was out of order, and the whole worship of the Lord either defiled with superstitions, or intermingled with idolatries, as it was too often; did not God's servants tarry and await his leisure, till those who were supreme both in place and power were by him prompted and inflamed to a reformation? How many years had that whole people made an idol of the brasen serpent, and burnt incense to it, before it was defaced by king Hezekiah? How many more might it have longer stood undefaced, untouched by any of the common people, had not the king given order to demolish it? How many years had the seduced Israelites adored before the altar of Bethel, before it was hewn down and cut in pieces by the good king Josiah? And yet it cannot be denied but that it was as much *in the power* of the Jews to destroy that idol, and of the honest and religious Israelites to break down that altar; as it either was, or could be, *in the power* of our English zealots to beat down superstitious pictures and images, had they been so minded. Solomon, in the book of Canticles, compares the church unto an army, *acies castrorum ordinata*, as the Vulgar hath it, "an army terrible with banners," as our English reads it. A powerful body, out of doubt, able, which way soever it moves, to waste and destroy the country, to burn and sack the villages through which it passeth. And, questionless, too many of the soldiers, knowing their own power, would be apt to do it, if not restrained by the authority of their commanders and the laws of war. *Ita se ducum autoritas, sic rigor disciplinæ habet*, as we find in Tacitus.\* And if those be not kept as they ought to be, *confusi equites peditesque in exitium ruunt*; "the whole runs on to a swift destruction." Thus is it also in the church with the camp of God: if there be no subordination in it, if every one might do what he list himself, and make such uses of that *power* and opportunity as he thinks are put into his hands, what a confusion would ensue! how speedy a calamity must needs fall upon it! Courage and zeal do never show more amiably in inferior powers, than when they are subordinate to good directions, especially when they take directions from the right hand, from the supreme magistrate, not from the interest and passion of their fellow-subjects. It is the prince's office to command, and theirs to execute. With which wise caution the emperor Otho once repressed the too great forwardness of his soldiers,

\* TACITI *Historia*, l. i.

when he found them apt enough to make use of their power in a matter not commanded by him: *Vobis arma et animus, mihi consilium et virtutis vestræ regimen relinquite*, as his words there are.\* He understood their duty, and his own authority, allows them to have power and will, but regulates and restrains them both to his own command. So that whether we behold the Church in its own condition, proceeding by the warrant and examples of holy Scripture, or in resemblance to an army, (as compared by Solomon,) there will be nothing left to the *power* of the people either in way of reformation or execution, till they be vested and intrusted with some lawful power derived from him whom God hath placed in authority over them. And therefore though idolatry be to be destroyed, and to be destroyed by all which have power to do it, yet must all those be furnished with a lawful power, or otherwise stand guilty of as high a crime as that which they so zealously endeavour to condemn in others.

3. But our author is not of this mind; and therefore adds, That “if the sovereign do forget, the subjects should remember their duty.” A lesson which he never learned in the book of God. For, besides the examples which we have in demolishing the brasen serpent and the altar of Bethel, not acted by the power of the people, but the command of the prince; I would fain know where we shall find, in the whole course and current of the holy Scriptures, that the common people, in and by their own authority, removed the high places, and destroyed the images, or cut down the groves,—those excellent instruments of superstition and idolatry; or that they did attempt any such thing till warranted and commissioned by the supreme powers. Where shall we find that any of the “seven thousand persons which had not bowed the knee to Baal,” did ever go about to destroy that idol? Or that Elijah or Elisha (two men as extraordinary for their calling as their zeal and courage) did excite them to it? Where shall we find the primitive Christians, when living under the command of Heathenish emperors, busied in destroying idols, or defacing the temples of those gods whom the Pagans worshipped? though grown in those times to such infinite multitudes, that “they filled all places of the empire, *et vestra omnia implevimus*, cities, isles, castles, boroughs, your places of assembly, camps, tribes, palaces, yea, the very senate and common forum,” as Tertullian pleads it. No other doctrine preached or heard of till either the new Gospel of Wickliffe, or the new lights shining from Geneva, gave beginning to it: when the Genevians were resolved on a Reformation, and could not get the consent of their bishop, who was also their immediate prince, they resolved to take the work into their own hands, and proceed without him. And that the presence of their bishop might not be a hinderance unto their designs, they raised a tumult, put themselves into a posture of war, and thereby force him and his clergy to forsake the city. And this being done, they did not only order matters of religion

\* TACITI *Historia*, l. i.

as they pleased themselves, but took the sovereignty of the city into their own hands, "changing the government thereof to the form of a commonwealth." *Eo ejecto, Genevates monarchiam in popularem statum commutarunt*, as Calvin hath it in his epistle unto Cardinal Sadolet. The practice of these men, drawn afterwards into example by Knox, and others, became at last to be the standing rule and measure of all Reformations. For when the king and queen of Scots refused to ratify two Acts which were sent unto them concerning the abolishing of the mass, and the pope's supremacy, Knox, Winram, and the rest of that gang, without more ado devised and set up a new form of discipline, engrossing that power unto the kirk, which formerly had been usurped by the popes of Rome. ("Hist. of Queen Mary," fol. 25.) Afterwards when the queen was returned into Scotland, and that some of their importunate petitions were neglected by her, it was concluded by the ministers in as plain terms as might be, that "if the queen will not, then we must." (*Idem*, fol. 33.)

According to this rule the Netherlands proceeded also, not only driving on the design which they had in hand, (as the French Hugonots also did,) without the king's authority, but against it also. Finally, from a matter practical, it came at last to be delivered for a point of doctrine, that if the prince or supreme magistrate did not reform the church, then the people might. For this I find in Clesselius, one of the *Contra-Remonstrants* of Rotterdam. "If," saith he, "the prince and clergy do neglect their duties in the reforming of the church, *necesse est tum id facere plebeios Israelitas*, that then it doth belong to the common people." And it is with a *necesse* too, if you mark it well; they might not only do it, but they must be doing: "Not in the way of mediation or petition," by which the dignity of the magistrate might be preserved, "but by force and violence, *licet ad sanguinem usque pro eo pugnent*, even to the shedding of their own blood, and their brethren's too." Our author preacheth the same doctrine; whether by way of application or instruction, it comes all to one; for, *qui parentes laudat filios provocat*, as Lactantius has it: "Posterity is too soon taught to follow the ill examples of their predecessors." And though he press it not so home as Clesselius did, yet, when the gap is once set open, and the hedge of authority torn down, bloodshed and war, and other acts of open violence, will come in of course. So that we may affirm of this dangerous doctrine, as the Sorbonnists once did of the Jesuits: *viz., Videtur in negotio fidei periculosa, pacis ecclesiæ perturbativa, et magis ad destructionem quàm ad ædificationem*. But I have stayed too long upon these first notes: I now proceed unto the rest.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor hath dealt most unfairly with me in citing by the halves what I have written, and leaving out what immediately followed, and what he ought to have inserted; namely,—

For after I had presented the judgment of these rigid and

violent Hotspurs, I subjoined as followeth, in confutation of their extravagancies :—

“ But others condemned their indiscretion herein ; for though they might reform the private persons and families, and refrain to communicate in any outward act contrary to God’s word ; yet public reformation belonged to the magistrate ; and a good deed was by them ill done, for want of a calling to do it.”

I appeal to such who knew me in the University, to those that have heard my many sermons on this subject in London and elsewhere, but especially to my book called “ Truth maintained,” made against Mr. Saltmarsh ; wherein I have heartily, (to place that first,) largely, and, to my power, strongly vindicated : *Non licet populo, renuente magistratu, reformationem moliri*. Our author proceeds :—

154. DR. HEYLIN.—“ This Parliament being very active in matters of religion, the Convocation (younger brother thereunto) was little employed, and less regarded.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 443.) Our author follows his design of putting matters of religion into the power of Parliaments, though he hath chosen a very ill medium to conclude the point. This Parliament, as active as he seems to make it, troubled itself so little with matters of religion, that, had it done less, it had done just nothing. All that it did, was the repealing of some Acts made in the time of queen Mary, and settling matters in the same state in which she found them at her first coming to the crown. The Common-Prayer Book, being reviewed and fitted to the use of the church by some godly men, appointed by the queen alone, received no other confirmation in this present Parliament, than what it had before in the last years of king Edward. The supremacy was again restored, as it had been formerly ; the title of “ supreme head,” which seemed offensive unto many of both religions, being changed into that of “ supreme governor ;” nothing in all this done *de novo*, which could entitle this Parliament to such activity in matters of religion, but that our author had a mind to undervalue the Convocation, as being “ little employed, and less regarded.” I grant, indeed, that the Convocation of that year did only meet for form’s sake, without acting any thing ; and there was very good reason for it. The bishops at that time were so tenaciously addicted to the church of Rome, that they chose all (except Anthony Kitchen of Landaff) rather to lose their bishoprics than take the oath of supremacy. So that there was little or no hope of doing any thing in Convocation to the queen’s content, in order to the reformation of religion, which was then designed, had they been suffered to debate, treat, and conclude of such particulars as had relation thereunto. But we shall see, when things are somewhat better settled, that the activity of the next Convocation will make amends for the silence and insignificancy of this.



FULLER.—“Yea, God hath done great things for us already, whereof we rejoyce.” And although the Animadvertor is pleased to say, That “if this Parliament had done less, it had done just nothing;” these truly were *magnalia*, so far as the word is applicable to human performances.

155. DR. HEYLIN.—In the mean time, I would fain know our author’s reason, why, speaking of the Convocation and the Parliament in the notion of twins, the Convocation must be made “the younger brother.” Assuredly, there had been Convocations in the church of England some hundreds of years before the name of Parliament had been ever heard of; which he that lists to read the Collection of Councils published by that learned and industrious gentleman, *sr* Henry Spelman, cannot but perceive.

FULLER.—I confess Convocations, in their general notion, more ancient, and regular, and completely constituted than Parliaments. Yet of these twins, I called the Convocation “the younger brother” properly enough:

First. Because modern Convocations, as modelled since the submission of the clergy to Henry VIII. are many years junior to Parliaments.

Secondly. The Convocations always began the day after the Parliament, the archbishops and bishops always attending the king the first day in Parliament.

Lastly. The Parliament hath made a “younger brother” of the Convocation: and, there being a priority in power, he in effect is the heir and elder brother who confineth the other to a poor pittance and small portion, as our age can well remember. Our author proceeds:—

156—158. DR. HEYLIN.—“This year the spire of Paul’s steeple, covered with lead, strangely fell on fire.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 467.) More modestly in this than when he formerly ascribes the burning of some great abbeys to lightning from heaven. And so this steeple was both reported and believed to be fired also; it being an ordinary thing in our common almanacs, till these latter times, to count the time (among the other epochs of computation) from the year that St. Paul’s steeple was fired with lightning. But afterwards it was acknowledged (as our author truly notes) to be done “by the negligence of a plumber, carelessly leaving his coals therein:” since which acknowledgment, we find no mention of this accident in our yearly almanacs. But whereas our author finds no other benefactors for the repairing of this great ruin; but the queen’s bounty, and the clergy’s benevolence, I must needs tell him that these were only accessories to the principal charge. The greatest part hereof, or, to say better, the whole work was by the queen imposed on the city of London, it being



affirmed by John Stow, that "after this mischance the queen's majesty directed her letters to the mayor, willing him to take order for the speedy repairing of the same." And, in pursuance of that order, (besides what issued from the public stock in the Chamber of London,) "the citizens gave first a great benevolence, and after that three-fifteens to be speedily paid."\* What the queen did in the way of furtherance, or the clergy of the province of Canterbury in the way of help, is to be looked upon as their free voluntary act, no otherwise obliged thereto, but as the public honour of the church and state did invite them to it. The mayor and city were the parties upon whom the command was laid, as most concerned in the repair of their own cathedral. Which I thought good to put our author in mind of as a fault of omission only, leaving such use as may be made of the observation to the care of others.

"Here I would fain be informed, by some learned men in the law, what needed the restoring of those children whose father was condemned and died only for heresy, which is conceived a personal crime, and not tainting the blood?" (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 468.) The Parliament this year had passed an Act for the Restitution in blood of the children of Thomas Cranmer, late archbishop of Canterbury; for which our author, as it seems, can see no reason, in regard he was "condemned and died only for heresy. For though," saith he, "this archbishop was first accused of high treason, yet it afterward was waved, and he tried upon heretical opinions." But in this our author is mistaken. For, though Cranmer was condemned and died for heresy, yet he was not condemned for that only; nor was the accusation for treason waved, as he saith it was, but the conviction of him as an heretic superadded to it. Being accused of high treason for subscribing (though unwillingly) to the proclamation of the lady Jane, he was committed to the Tower on the 15th of September, and on the 13th of November following arraigned at the Guildhall in London, and there convicted and condemned, together with the said lady Jane, the lord Guilford Dudley her husband, and the lord Ambrose Dudley her husband's brother.† Of which four the lady Jane and her husband only suffered death on that condemnation; the lord Ambrose Dudley being reprieved for a better fortune, and the archbishop reserved for a more cruel death. For the queen, finding it more satisfactory to the Court of Rome to have him burnt for an heretic than hanged for a traitor, and being implacably bent against him for his activeness in the divorce, thought good to wave her first proceeding, and to have him put to death for heresy. But the attainder holding still good at the Common Law, there was great reason why his children should desire a restitution in blood, not otherwise to be obtained but by Act of Parliament. And so, without troubling "the learned in the law" for our information, I hope our author will be satisfied, and save his fee for other more necessary uses.

\* STOW'S "Survey of London," p. 623.

† STOW'S "Annals," fol. 617.

FULLER.—“Yea, God hath done great things for us already, whereof we rejoyce.” And although the Animadvertor is pleased to say, That “if this Parliament had done less, it had done just nothing;” these truly were *magnalia*, so far as the word is applicable to human performances.

155. DR. HEYLIN.—In the mean time, I would fain know our author’s reason, why, speaking of the Convocation and the Parliament in the notion of twins, the Convocation must be made “the younger brother.” Assuredly, there had been Convocations in the church of England some hundreds of years before the name of Parliament had been ever heard of; which he that lists to read the Collection of Councils published by that learned and industrious gentleman, *sr* Henry Spelman, cannot but perceive.

FULLER.—I confess Convocations, in their general notion, more ancient, and regular, and completely constituted than Parliaments. Yet of these twins, I called the Convocation “the younger brother” properly enough:

First. Because modern Convocations, as modelled since the submission of the clergy to Henry VIII. are many years junior to Parliaments.

Secondly. The Convocations always began the day after the Parliament, the archbishops and bishops always attending the king the first day in Parliament.

Lastly. The Parliament hath made a “younger brother” of the Convocation: and, there being a priority in power, he in effect is the heir and elder brother who confineth the other to a poor pittance and small portion, as our age can well remember. Our author proceeds:—

156—158. DR. HEYLIN.—“This year the spire of Paul’s steeple, covered with lead, strangely fell on fire.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 467.) More modestly in this than when he formerly ascribes the burning of some great abbeys to lightning from heaven. And so this steeple was both reported and believed to be fired also; it being an ordinary thing in our common almanacs, till these latter times, to count the time (among the other epochs of computation) from the year that St. Paul’s steeple was fired with lightning. But afterwards it was acknowledged (as our author truly notes) to be done “by the negligence of a plumber, carelessly leaving his coals therein:” since which acknowledgment, we find no mention of this accident in our yearly almanacs. But whereas our author finds no other benefactors for the repairing of this great ruin; but the queen’s bounty, and the clergy’s benevolence, I must needs tell him that these were only accessories to the principal charge. The greatest part hereof, or, to say better, the whole work was by the queen imposed on the city of London, it being

affirmed by John Stow, that "after this mischance the queen's majesty directed her letters to the mayor, willing him to take order for the speedy repairing of the same." And, in pursuance of that order, (besides what issued from the public stock in the Chamber of London,) "the citizens gave first a great benevolence, and after that three-fifteens to be speedily paid."\* What the queen did in the way of furtherance, or the clergy of the province of Canterbury in the way of help, is to be looked upon as their free voluntary act, no otherwise obliged thereto, but as the public honour of the church and state did invite them to it. The mayor and city were the parties upon whom the command was laid, as most concerned in the repair of their own cathedral. Which I thought good to put our author in mind of as a fault of omission only, leaving such use as may be made of the observation to the care of others.

"Here I would fain be informed, by some learned men in the law, what needed the restoring of those children whose father was condemned and died only for heresy, which is conceived a personal crime, and not tainting the blood?" (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 468.) The Parliament this year had passed an Act for the Restitution in blood of the children of Thomas Cranmer, late archbishop of Canterbury; for which our author, as it seems, can see no reason, in regard he was "condemned and died only for heresy. For though," saith he, "this archbishop was first accused of high treason, yet it afterward was waved, and he tried upon heretical opinions." But in this our author is mistaken. For, though Cranmer was condemned and died for heresy, yet he was not condemned for that only; nor was the accusation for treason waved, as he saith it was, but the conviction of him as an heretic superadded to it. Being accused of high treason for subscribing (though unwillingly) to the proclamation of the lady Jane, he was committed to the Tower on the 15th of September, and on the 13th of November following arraigned at the Guildhall in London, and there convicted and condemned, together with the said lady Jane, the lord Guilford Dudley her husband, and the lord Ambrose Dudley her husband's brother.† Of which four the lady Jane and her husband only suffered death on that condemnation; the lord Ambrose Dudley being reprieved for a better fortune, and the archbishop reserved for a more cruel death. For the queen, finding it more satisfactory to the Court of Rome to have him burnt for an heretic than hanged for a traitor, and being implacably bent against him for his activeness in the divorce, thought good to wave her first proceeding, and to have him put to death for heresy. But the attainder holding still good at the Common Law, there was great reason why his children should desire a restitution in blood, not otherwise to be obtained but by Act of Parliament. And so, without troubling "the learned in the law" for our information, I hope our author will be satisfied, and save his fee for other more necessary uses.

\* STOW'S "Survey of London," p. 623.

† STOW'S "Annals," fol. 617.

as they pleased themselves, but took the sovereignty of the city into their own hands, "changing the government thereof to the form of a commonwealth." *Eo ejecto, Genevates monarchiam in popularem statum commutarunt*, as Calvin hath it in his epistle unto Cardinal Sadolet. The practice of these men, drawn afterwards into example by Knox, and others, became at last to be the standing rule and measure of all Reformations. For when the king and queen of Scots refused to ratify two Acts which were sent unto them concerning the abolishing of the mass, and the pope's supremacy, Knox, Winram, and the rest of that gang, without more ado devised and set up a new form of discipline, engrossing that power unto the kirk, which formerly had been usurped by the popes of Rome. ("Hist. of Queen Mary," fol. 25.) Afterwards when the queen was returned into Scotland, and that some of their importunate petitions were neglected by her, it was concluded by the ministers in as plain terms as might be, that "if the queen will not, then we must." (*Idem*, fol. 33.)

According to this rule the Netherlands proceeded also, not only driving on the design which they had in hand, (as the French Hugonots also did,) without the king's authority, but against it also. Finally, from a matter practical, it came at last to be delivered for a point of doctrine, that if the prince or supreme magistrate did not reform the church, then the people might. For this I find in Clesselius, one of the *Contra-Remonstrants* of Rotterdam. "If," saith he, "the prince and clergy do neglect their duties in the reforming of the church, *necesse est tum id facere plebeios Israelitas*, that then it doth belong to the common people." And it is with a *necesse* too, if you mark it well; they might not only do it, but they must be doing: "Not in the way of mediation or petition," by which the dignity of the magistrate might be preserved, "but by force and violence, *licet ad sanguinem usque pro eo pugnent*, even to the shedding of their own blood, and their brethren's too." Our author preacheth the same doctrine; whether by way of application or instruction, it comes all to one; for, *qui parentes laudat filios provocat*, as Lactantius has it: "Posterity is too soon taught to follow the ill examples of their predecessors." And though he press it not so home as Clesselius did, yet, when the gap is once set open, and the hedge of authority torn down, bloodshed and war, and other acts of open violence, will come in of course. So that we may affirm of this dangerous doctrine, as the Sorbonnists once did of the Jesuits: *viz.*, *Videtur in negotio fidei periculosa, pacis ecclesiæ perturbativa, et magis ad destructionem quàm ad ædificationem*. But I have stayed too long upon these first notes: I now proceed unto the rest.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor hath dealt most unfairly with me in citing by the halves what I have written, and leaving out what immediately followed, and what he ought to have inserted; namely,—

For after I had presented the judgment of these rigid and

affirmed by John Stow, that "after this mischance the queen's majesty directed her letters to the mayor, willing him to take order for the speedy repairing of the same." And, in pursuance of that order, (besides what issued from the public stock in the Chamber of London,) "the citizens gave first a great benevolence, and after that three-fifteens to be speedily paid."\* What the queen did in the way of furtherance, or the clergy of the province of Canterbury in the way of help, is to be looked upon as their free voluntary act, no otherwise obliged thereto, but as the public honour of the church and state did invite them to it. The mayor and city were the parties upon whom the command was laid, as most concerned in the repair of their own cathedral. Which I thought good to put our author in mind of as a fault of omission only, leaving such use as may be made of the observation to the care of others.

"Here I would fain be informed, by some learned men in the law, what needed the restoring of those children whose father was condemned and died only for heresy, which is conceived a personal crime, and not tainting the blood?" (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 468.) The Parliament this year had passed an Act for the Restitution in blood of the children of Thomas Cranmer, late archbishop of Canterbury; for which our author, as it seems, can see no reason, in regard he was "condemned and died only for heresy. For though," saith he, "this archbishop was first accused of high treason, yet it afterward was waved, and he tried upon heretical opinions." But in this our author is mistaken. For, though Cranmer was condemned and died for heresy, yet he was not condemned for that only; nor was the accusation for treason waved, as he saith it was, but the conviction of him as an heretic superadded to it. Being accused of high treason for subscribing (though unwillingly) to the proclamation of the lady Jane, he was committed to the Tower on the 15th of September, and on the 13th of November following arraigned at the Guildhall in London, and there convicted and condemned, together with the said lady Jane, the lord Guilford Dudley her husband, and the lord Ambrose Dudley her husband's brother.† Of which four the lady Jane and her husband only suffered death on that condemnation; the lord Ambrose Dudley being reprieved for a better fortune, and the archbishop reserved for a more cruel death. For the queen, finding it more satisfactory to the Court of Rome to have him burnt for an heretic than hanged for a traitor, and being implacably bent against him for his activeness in the divorce, thought good to wave her first proceeding, and to have him put to death for heresy. But the attainder holding still good at the Common Law, there was great reason why his children should desire a restitution in blood, not otherwise to be obtained but by Act of Parliament. And so, without troubling "the learned in the law" for our information, I hope our author will be satisfied, and save his fee for other more necessary uses.

\* STOW'S "Survey of London," p. 623.

† STOW'S "Annals," fol. 617.

FULLER.—“Yea, God hath done great things for us already, whereof we rejoyce.” And although the Animadvertor is pleased to say, That “if this Parliament had done less, it had done just nothing;” these truly were *magnalia*, so far as the word is applicable to human performances.

155. DR. HEYLIN.—In the mean time, I would fain know our author’s reason, why, speaking of the Convocation and the Parliament in the notion of twins, the Convocation must be made “the younger brother.” Assuredly, there had been Convocations in the church of England some hundreds of years before the name of Parliament had been ever heard of; which he that lists to read the Collection of Councils published by that learned and industrious gentleman, sir Henry Spelman, cannot but perceive.

FULLER.—I confess Convocations, in their general notion, more ancient, and regular, and completely constituted than Parliaments. Yet of these twins, I called the Convocation “the younger brother” properly enough :

First. Because modern Convocations, as modelled since the submission of the clergy to Henry VIII. are many years junior to Parliaments.

Secondly. The Convocations always began the day after the Parliament, the archbishops and bishops always attending the king the first day in Parliament.

Lastly. The Parliament hath made a “younger brother” of the Convocation: and, there being a priority in power, he in effect is the heir and elder brother who confineth the other to a poor pittance and small portion, as our age can well remember. Our author proceeds :—

156—158. DR. HEYLIN.—“This year the spire of Paul’s steeple, covered with lead, strangely fell on fire.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 467.) More modestly in this than when he formerly ascribes the burning of some great abbeyes to lightning from heaven. And so this steeple was both reported and believed to be fired also; it being an ordinary thing in our common almanacs, till these latter times, to count the time (among the other epochs of computation) from the year that St. Paul’s steeple was fired with lightning. But afterwards it was acknowledged (as our author truly notes) to be done “by the negligence of a plumber, carelessly leaving his coals therein:” since which acknowledgment, we find no mention of this accident in our yearly almanacs. But whereas our author finds no other benefactors for the repairing of this great ruin; but the queen’s bounty, and the clergy’s benevolence, I must needs tell him that these were only accessories to the principal charge. The greatest part hereof, or, to say better, the whole work was by the queen imposed on the city of London, it being



affirmed by John Stow, that "after this mischance the queen's majesty directed her letters to the mayor, willing him to take order for the speedy repairing of the same." And, in pursuance of that order, (besides what issued from the public stock in the Chamber of London,) "the citizens gave first a great benevolence, and after that three-fifteens to be speedily paid."\* What the queen did in the way of furtherance, or the clergy of the province of Canterbury in the way of help, is to be looked upon as their free voluntary act, no otherwise obliged thereto, but as the public honour of the church and state did invite them to it. The mayor and city were the parties upon whom the command was laid, as most concerned in the repair of their own cathedral. Which I thought good to put our author in mind of as a fault of omission only, leaving such use as may be made of the observation to the care of others.

"Here I would fain be informed, by some learned men in the law, what needed the restoring of those children whose father was condemned and died only for heresy, which is conceived a personal crime, and not tainting the blood?" (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 468.) The Parliament this year had passed an Act for the Restitution in blood of the children of Thomas Cranmer, late archbishop of Canterbury; for which our author, as it seems, can see no reason, in regard he was "condemned and died only for heresy. For though," saith he, "this archbishop was first accused of high treason, yet it afterward was waved, and he tried upon heretical opinions." But in this our author is mistaken. For, though Cranmer was condemned and died for heresy, yet he was not condemned for that only; nor was the accusation for treason waved, as he saith it was, but the conviction of him as an heretic superadded to it. Being accused of high treason for subscribing (though unwillingly) to the proclamation of the lady Jane, he was committed to the Tower on the 15th of September, and on the 13th of November following arraigned at the Guildhall in London, and there convicted and condemned, together with the said lady Jane, the lord Guilford Dudley her husband, and the lord Ambrose Dudley her husband's brother.† Of which four the lady Jane and her husband only suffered death on that condemnation; the lord Ambrose Dudley being reprieved for a better fortune, and the archbishop reserved for a more cruel death. For the queen, finding it more satisfactory to the Court of Rome to have him burnt for an heretic than hanged for a traitor, and being implacably bent against him for his activeness in the divorce, thought good to wave her first proceeding, and to have him put to death for heresy. But the attainder holding still good at the Common Law, there was great reason why his children should desire a restitution in blood, not otherwise to be obtained but by Act of Parliament. And so, without troubling "the learned in the law" for our information, I hope our author will be satisfied, and save his fee for other more necessary uses.

\* STOW'S "Survey of London," p. 623.

† STOW'S "Annals," fol. 617.



FULLER.—*Non est tanti* all this note. The queen and clergy are only mentioned by way of *eminence*, not *exclusion* of others.

The Animadvertor commonly layeth it to my charge, that in my writing I am injurious to the church and clergy; and now he is offended with me for giving them too much honour.

Sure I am, Mr. Camden,\* speaking of the repairing of St. Paul's on this occasion, ascribes it "to the great bounty of the queen," and money gathered of the churchmen and others; where his particular nomination only of the queen and churchmen, making them paramount benefactors. Our author proceeds:—

159. DR. HEYLIN.—"In the Convocation now sitting, the nine-and-thirty Articles were composed, agreeing for the main with those set forth in the reign of king Edward VI. though in some particulars allowing more liberty to dissenting judgments." (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 468.) This is the active Convocation which before I spake of, not settling matters of religion in the same estate in which they were left by king Edward; but altering some Articles, expunging others, adding some *de novo*, and fitting the whole body of them unto edification; not leaving any "liberty to dissenting judgments," as our author would have it, but binding men unto the literal and grammatical sense.

FULLER.—But "the literal and grammatical sense" is worded in so favourable and receptive terms, that two opposite parties, both well skilled in grammar, have, with great assurance of success, pleaded them in their defence.

In such cases, when the controversy is admissive of a latitude, as not necessary to salvation, the pious and learned penners of the Articles, though they did not purposely use *cheverel* expressions, (to afford shelter to equivocation,) yet prudently *seeing* that all things in the Articles were not of equal concernment, and politicly *foreseeing* men would be divided and differ in their judgments about them, selected phrases grammatically admissive of several senses, all consistent with salvation; and would draw their words no closer, for fear of strangling tender consciences. Hence is it that in the question, "Whether concupiscence be properly a sin in the regenerate?" both parties appeal unto the Article, equally persuaded there to find favour in their several opinions; as indeed, like a well-drawn picture, it seemeth to *eye* them both, and yet *frown* on neither.

And one may read in "the Works of king James," that on this account he highly commendeth the discretion and moderation of the composers of our Articles.

160. DR. HEYLIN.—They had not otherwise attained to the end

\* In his "Elizabeth," anno 1561.

they aimed at, which was *ad tollendam opinionum dissensionem, et consensum in verâ religione firmandum*; that is to say, “to take away diversity of opinions, and to establish an agreement in the true religion;” which end could never be effected, if men were left unto “the liberty of dissenting,” or might have leave to put their own sense upon the Articles. But whereas our author instances in the Article “of Christ’s descent into hell,” telling us that Christ’s preaching unto the spirits there (on which the Article seemed to be grounded in king Edward’s book) was left out in this; and thereupon inferreth, that men are “left unto a latitude concerning the cause, time, manner of his descent;” I must needs say, that he is very much mistaken. For, First, the church of England hath always constantly maintained a local descent; though many which would be thought her children, the better to comply with Calvin and some other divines of foreign nations, have deviated in this point from the sense of the church. And, Secondly, the reason why this Convocation left out that passage of Christ preaching to the spirits in hell, was not, that men might be “left unto a latitude concerning the cause, time, and manner of his descent,” as our author dreams; but because that passage of St. Peter, being capable of some other interpretations, was not conceived to be a clear and sufficient evidence to prove the Article. For which see bishop BILSON’S “Survey,” pp. 388, 389.

FULLER.—I cannot fully concur with the Animadvertor, “That the church of England hath constantly maintained a local descent,” though no man hath a higher esteem for those worthy writers who are of that persuasion.

I will confess this hitherto hath staggered me; namely, St. Peter’s application of David’s words to Christ: “Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell,” Acts ii. 27.

I appeal whether these words import not a favour (to all unprejudiced hearers) which God did to his Son, bearing this natural and unviolated sense: “That had God left Christ’s soul in hell, his soul had been in a bad condition, as being there in a suffering capacity; but God’s paternal affection to his dear Son would not leave his soul in hell, but did rescue it thence.”

Now all our protestant and especially English writers, who maintain “a local descent,” do very worthily (in opposition to the Romish error) defend, that Christ was then in a good estate, yea, in a triumphing condition.

Now, then, it had been no favour, not to leave his soul in hell; but a less love unto him, to contract his happiness in his triumph.

I protest, that, in this or any other point, I am not possessed with a spirit of opposition; and when I am herein satisfied in any good degree, I shall become the Animadvertor’s thankful convert in this particular. Our author proceeds.—

161—164. DR. HEYLIN.—“ In a word, concerning this clause, whether the bishops were faulty in their addition, or their opposites in their subtraction, I leave to more cunning state-arithmeticians to decide.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 472.) The clause here spoken of by our author, is the first sentence in the twentieth Article, entitled *De Ecclesiæ Authoritate*, where it is said that “the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of the faith.” Which being charged upon the bishops as a late addition, the better to support their power and maintain their tyranny; the late archbishop of Canterbury, in his speech in the Star-Chamber, June 15th, 1637, made it appear that the said clause was in a printed Book of Articles published in the year 1563, being but very few months after they had passed in the Convocation, which was on the 29th of January, 1562, in the English account. And more than so, he showed unto the Lords a copy of the twentieth Article exemplified out of the records, and attested by the hands of a public notary, in which that very clause was found, which had been charged upon the bishops for an innovation. And thus much I can say of mine own knowledge, that, having occasion to consult the Records of Convocation, I found this controverted clause *verbatim* in these following words: *Habet ecclesia ritus statuendi jus, et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem*. Which makes me wonder at our author, that, having access to those records, and making frequent use of them in this present History, he should declare himself unable to decide the doubt, whether the addition of this clause was made by the bishops, or the subtraction of it by the opposite party. But “none so blind as he that will not see,” says the good old proverb.

But our author will not so give over. He must first have a fling at the archbishop of Canterbury upon this occasion: In the year 1571, (the Puritan faction beginning then to grow very strong,) the Articles were again printed both in Latin and English, and this clause left out; published according to those copies in the “Harmony of Confessions” printed at Geneva, *anno* 1612, and published by the same at Oxford, (though soon after rectified,) *anno* 1636. Now the archbishop, taking notice of the first alteration, *anno* 1571, declares in his said speech, that it was no hard matter for that opposite faction to have the Articles printed and this clause left out, “considering who they were that then governed businesses and rid the church almost at their pleasure.”\* What says our author to this? Marry, saith he, “I am not so well skilled in historical horsemanship as to know whom his Grace designed for the rider of the church at that time.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 472.) Strange that a man who undertakes to write an History should profess himself ignorant of the names of those who “governed the business of the times” he writes of. But this is only an affected ignorance, professed of purpose to preserve the honour of some men whom he beholds as the chief patrons of the Puritan faction.

\* Archbishop's Speech, p. 71.

For, afterwards, (this turn being served,) he can find out who they were that then “governed businesses, and rid the church almost at their pleasure;” telling us, that “the earl of Leicester interposed himself patron-general to the non-subscribers, and that he did it at the persuasion of Roger lord North.” (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 29.) Besides which two, we find sir Francis Knollys to be one of those who gave countenance to the troubles at Frankfort, at such time as the faction was there hottest against the Liturgy, and other rites and ceremonies of the church of England; (*Idem*, vol. ii. p. 419;) who, being a mere kinsman of the queen’s, and a Privy Councillor, made use of all advantages to pursue that project, which, being set on foot beyond sea, had been driven on here; and though Leicester was enough of himself to ride the church at his pleasure, it being fitted with such helps, (sir Francis Walsingham and many more of that kind which the times then gave him,) they drove on the faster, till he had almost plunged all in remediless ruin. But our author hath not done with these Articles yet; for he tells us of this clause, that it was

“Omitted in the English and Latin Articles set forth, 1571, when they were first ratified by Act.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 471.) Our author doth so dream of the power of Parliaments in matters of religion, that he will not suffer any Canon or Act of Convocation to be in force, or obligatory to the subject, till confirmed by Parliament. But I would fain know of him where he finds any Act of Parliament (except it be in his own dreams) to confirm these Articles; or that the Parliament of the 13th of the queen (being that he speaks of) appointed any Committee for Religion to examine the orthodoxy of those Articles, and make report unto the House. All that was done was this, and on this occasion:—Some ministers of the church too stiffly wedded to their old *mumpsimus* of the Mass, and some as furiously prosecuting their new *sumpsimus* of Inconformity, it was thought fit that, between these contending parties, the doctrine of the church should be kept inviolate. And thereupon it was enacted, That every person under the degree of a Bishop, which did or should pretend to be a priest or minister of God’s holy word and sacraments in the church of England, should, before Christmas then next following, in the presence of his diocesan bishop, testify his assent, and subscribe to the said Articles of the year 1562. Secondly. That, after such subscribing before the bishop, he should, on some Sunday in the forenoon in the church or chapel where he served, in time of divine service, read openly the said Articles, on pain of being deprived of all his ecclesiastical promotions, as if he were then naturally dead. Thirdly. That if any ecclesiastical person should maintain any doctrine contrary to any of the said Articles, and being convented by his bishop, &c. should persist therein, it should be just cause to deprive such person of his ecclesiastical promotions. Fourthly. That all persons to be admitted to any benefice with cure, should likewise subscribe to the said Articles, and publicly read the same in the open church within two months after their induc-

tion, with declaration of their unfeigned assent to the same, on the pain aforesaid.\* In all which there was nothing done to confirm these Articles, but only a pious care expressed for reformation of such disorders as were like to rise amongst the ministers of the church, by requiring their subscription and assent unto them under such temporal punishments, which at that time the Canons of the church had not laid upon them. So that our author very well might have spared this flourish, that the obligatoriness of these Articles as to temporal punishments "bears not date nine years before, from their composition in Convocation, but henceforward from their confirmation in Parliament." And here I must crave leave to fetch-in another passage relating to the Acts of this Convocation, in which he telleth us that till the year 1572, "the bishops had been more sparing in pressing, and others more daring in denying, subscription, because the Canons made in the Convocation, *anno* 1563, were not for nine years after confirmed by Act of Parliament," &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 502.) In which our author shows much zeal, and but little knowledge; there being no Canons made in the Convocation of 1562, (1563, in our author's reckoning,) nor any thing at all done in it more than the settling of the Articles, and passing a Bill for the granting of a subsidy to the queen, as by the Records thereof may be easily seen. But rather than the Parliament shall not have the power of confirming Canons, our author will find out some Canons for them to confirm which never had a being or existence but in his brains only.

FULLER.—To this and to what ensueth in two leaves following, I return no answer; not because I am pinched therein with any matter of moment, but for these reasons following:—

First. I understand, that the Animadvertor's stationer taketh exception, that I have printed all his book; which may tend to his detriment. Now I protest, when I first took up this resolution to present the Animadvertor's whole cloth, list, fag, and all, I aimed not at his damage, but my own defence: nor can I see how I could do otherwise, seeing the plaster must be as broad as the sore, the tent as deep as the wound; yea, I have been informed by prime stationers, the like hath formerly been done without exception taken on either side, in the replies and rejoinders betwixt Dr. Whitgift and Mr. Cartwright, and many others. However, being willing to avoid all appearance of injury, I have left out some observations which I conceived might well be spared, as containing no pungent matter against me.†

Secondly. I am confident, that there needs no other answer to

\* 13 Elizabeth, c. 12.

† The parts of HEYLIN'S "Animadversions" which were omitted by Fuller, on account of the remonstrance of Heylin's bookseller, are in this edition inserted entire, that the reader may have, at one view, the powerful reasonings of these two great masters of ecclesiastical history.—EDIT.

these notes, than the distinct and serious perusal of my "Church-History," with the due alteration of favour indulged to all writings.

Lastly. What of moment in these notes is omitted by me, relateth to those two church-questions in law, which I have formerly desired may fairly be ventilated betwixt the Animadvertor and me: and if he be sensible, that any thing herein tendeth to his advantage, he may, and no doubt will, re-assume and enforce the same.\*

165. DR. HEYLIN.—From the Articles our author proceeds unto the Homilies approved in those Articles; and of them he tells us, that "if they did little good, they did little harm." (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 473.) With scorn and insolence enough. Those Homilies were so composed, as to instruct the people in all positive doctrines necessary for Christian men to know, with reference both to faith and manners; and being "penned in a plain style," as our author hath it, were fitter for the edification of the common people, than either the strong lines of some, or the flashes of vain wit in others, in these latter times. And well it had been for the peace and happiness of this church, if they had been more constantly read, and not discredited by those men who studied to advance their own inventions above those grave and solid pieces composed by the joint counsels and co-operations of many godly, learned, and religious persons. But it is well, howsoever, that by reading these (so much vilified) Homilies, the ministers, though "they did little good, did but little harm;" it being to be feared that the predominant humour of sermonizing hath, on the contrary, done much harm, and but little good. But our author hath not yet done with this Convocation, for so it followeth:—

FULLER.—"With scorn and insolence!" I defy the words. The Animadvertor might have added my words immediately following; namely, "They preached not strange doctrines to their people, as too many vent new *darknesses* now-a-days, intituled *new lights*."

And well had it been for the peace and happiness of the church, if the Animadvertor (and all of his party) had had as high an esteem as the author hath for the Homilies; if none of them had called them "Homely Homilies;" (as one did;) and if they had conformed their practice to the second Homily in the second book, and not appeared so forward in countenancing images of God and his saints in churches.

166. DR. HEYLIN.—"The English bishops, conceiving themselves empowered by their Canons, began to show their authority, in urging the clergy of their diocess to subscribe to the Liturgy, ceremonies, and discipline of the church; and such as refused the same, were branded

\* *Idem supra*, part ii. p. 475.



with the odious name of Puritans." (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 474.) Our author having given the Parliament a power of confirming no Canons, as before was showed, he brings the bishops acting by as weak authority in the years 1563 and 1564, there being at that time no Canons for them to proceed upon for requiring their "clergy to subscribe to the Liturgies, ceremonies, and discipline of the church;" and therefore, if they did any such thing, it was not as they were "empowered by their Canons," but as they were enabled by that authority which was inherent naturally in their episcopal office.

FULLER.—I profess myself not to understand the sense of the Animadvertor, and what he driveth at herein. And as soon as I shall understand him, I will either fully concur with him, or fairly dissent from him, rendering my reason for the same.

167—171. DR. HEYLIN.—But, whereas he tells us in the following words, that the name of Puritan in that notion began this year, namely, 1564; I fear he hath anticipated the time a little; Genebrard, a right good chronologer, placing it (*ortos in Angliâ Puritanos*) about two years after, *anno* 1566. And so far I am of our author's mind, that "the grief had not been great if the name had ended that year," upon condition that the occasion for which it was given them had then ended also. But when he tells us, that the name of Puritans was given to "the opposers of the hierarchy and church-service," and signifieth a Nonconformist; as often as I meet such opposers, and such Nonconformists in the course of this History, I have warrant good enough to call them by the name of Puritans. If any did abuse the names, as he telleth us afterwards, "to asperse the most orthodox in doctrine and religious in conversation;" (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 306;) they were the more to blame; let them answer for it. But if those "orthodox and religious" persons were orthodox only in his sense, and under the colour of religion did secretly combine with "those who opposed the hierarchy and the established orders of the church;" it might be a disgrace, but no wrong unto them, to be called Puritans. And if it were extended further to denote such men also, as maintained any of the private opinions and doctrines of Calvin against the tendries of the church, I see no reason why our author should complain of it so much as he does in the place aforesaid. The practices of some men are many times doctrines to others: and the Calvinian doctrines being built upon Calvin's practices, and those abetted and confirmed by his following doctrines; the name of Puritan, though first found out to denote such as followed Calvin, "in dissenting from the hierarchy in discipline and church-government," might not unfitly be applied to such as maintained his doctrines also. But of this argument enough. I shall add only, and so proceed to other businesses, that Mr. Fox is brought-in as required to subscribe to the Canons by archbishop Parker; whereas there were at that time no Canons to subscribe unto, nor is it the custom of the church to require



subscription unto Canons, but unto those only who consented to the making of them.

“John Felton, who fastened the pope’s Bull to the palace of London, being taken, and refusing to fly, was hanged on a gibbet before the pope’s palace.” (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 495.) The Bull here mentioned was that of pope Pius V. for excommunicating queen Elizabeth, which this John Felton (a zealous papist) had hanged up at the gates of the bishop of London’s house, that the subjects might take notice of it; and for that fact was hanged near the same place where he had offended.

FULLER.—I answer, First. Let the Animadvertor keep his fears for me to himself, and not be solicitous in my behalf.

Secondly. If the time be anticipated *but a little*, these “necessary Animadversions” needed not to take notice thereof.

Thirdly. Genebrard’s placing the beginning of the name “Puritan” *about two years after*, intimates a latitude in his computation.

Fourthly. Genebrard, *anno* 1566, calleth them *ortos* (but not *orientes*) in *Angliâ Puritanos*; and when I speak of the beginning of the name, I relate to it *rising*, not *risen*.

Fifthly. Genebrard is so disaffected to our religion, he is not to be credited; taking all implicitly out of railing Saunders. Witness this eminent note amongst the rest, *anno* 1570: *Uncti in Surriâ comitatu Angliæ, e Calvinî scholâ oriuntur; qui docent peccare neminem nisi qui veritatem ab ipsis prædicatam non recipit*: “The anointed scholars of Calvin did rise this year in Surrey, an English county; who teach, that every man must sin that will not embrace their doctrine:” all which is a notorious untruth.

Lastly. The Animadvertor cannot justly be angry with me if I antedated the Puritans by two years, seeing he findeth the lineaments of the Puritan platform in the reign of king Henry VIII. twenty years at least before my mention of them.\*

172. DR. HEYLIN.—But why our author should call the bishop of London’s house by the name of “the pope’s palace,” I do very much wonder; unless it were to hold conformity with the style of Martin Mar-Prelate, and the rest of that faction. Amongst whom nothing was more common than to call all bishops “petty popes,” and more particularly to call the archbishop of Canterbury “the pope of Lambeth;” and the bishop of London, “pope of London.” But I hope more charitably than so, being more willing to impute it to the fault of the printers, than the pen of our author. I only add, that to make even with this John Felton, (a zealous papist,) another John Felton of the

\* *Vide supra*, part ii. p. 463.

next age, a zealous Puritan, committed that execrable murder on the duke of Buckingham.

FULLER.—It falls out happily for me, that Grindal was then bishop of London; one so far from popery, that he is beheld under an opposite notion. I wonder the Animadvertor will lay so much weight on a plain mistake of the press. Our author proceeds :—

173. DR. HEYLIN.—“Against covetous Conformists it was provided, that no spiritual person, college, or hospital, shall let lease, other than for twenty-one years, or three lives,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 498.) No mention in the Statute of “covetous Conformists,” I am sure of that; and therefore, no provision to be made against them: the “covetous Conformists” is our author’s own. I find indeed, that “long and unreasonable leases had been made by Colleges, deans, and chapters, parsons, vicars, and other having spiritual promotions;” which being found to be “the causes of dilapidations, and the decay of all spiritual livings and hospitality, and the utter impoverishing of all successors, incumbents in the same,” the Parliament thought it high time to provide against it.\* In all which bead-roll, it were strange if we should find no Nonconformists, who had by this time got a great part of the church-preferments, and were more likely to occasion those dilapidations than the regular and conformable clergy; these latter looking on the church with an eye to succession, the former being intent only on the present profit. And if we mark it well, we shall find that covetousness and Nonconformity are so married together, that it is not easy to divorce them; though here the crime of covetousness be wrongfully charged on the Conformists, to make them the more odious in the eye of the vulgar reader. “High royalists” in one place, “covetous Conformists” in another, are no good signs of true affections to conformity, and much less to royalty.

FULLER.—I say in the same place, that in this Parliament “laws were enacted against papists, Nonconformists, and covetous Conformists, the acts therein appearing like poniards with three edges.” Conformists they must needs be, who enjoyed so great church-preferment; and “covetous” I may call them, who made so unreasonable leases. But of this I have largely spoken in my Answer to the Introduction. Our author proceeds :—

174. DR. HEYLIN.—“These prophesyings were founded on the apostle’s precept: ‘For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn and all be comforted;’ but so as to make it out, they were fain to make use of human prudential additions.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 6.) Not grounded, but pretended to be grounded, on those words of St. Paul; the prophesying there spoken of not being to be drawn into example in the change of times, when the effusions of the Spirit were

\* 13 Elizabeth, c. 20.

more restrained and limited than they had been formerly. For were they grounded on that text, it had been somewhat saucily done, to add their own prudential additions to the direction and dictamen of the Holy Spirit: a course much favoured, as it seems, by archbishop Grindal, whose letter to the queen is recommended to the "welcome of the pious reader." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 7.) But both the queen and her wise Council conceived otherwise of it, looking upon these prophesyings as likely to "prove in fine the bane of the commonwealth," as our author hath it. Nor did king James conceive any better of them, as appeareth by the Conference at Hampton-Court, in which it was moved by Dr. Reynolds, (chief of the millenary party,) "That the clergy might have meetings once every three weeks, and therein to have prophesying, according as the reverend father archbishop Grindal and other bishops desired of her late majesty. 'No,' said the king, (looking upon this motion as a preamble to a Scottish Presbytery,) 'then Jack, and Tom, and Will, and Dick, shall at their pleasures censure me and my Council, and all our proceedings: then Will shall stand up and say, *It must be thus*: then Dick shall reply and say, *Nay, marry, but we will have it thus!* And therefore stay, I pray you, for one seven years before you demand that of me; and then if you find me pursy and fat, and my windpipes stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you: for if that government be once up, I am sure I shall be kept in breath; then shall we all of us have work enough, both our hands full.'"<sup>\*</sup> But let king James and queen Elizabeth conceive what they will, our author hath declared it to be "God's and the church's cause." (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 18.) And being such, it is enough to make any man confident in pleading for it, or appearing in it.

FULLER.—"Grounded" shall be altered, God willing, into "pretended to be grounded;" and then I hope no shadow of offence. Our author proceeds:—

175—178. DR. HEYLIN.—"A loud Parliament is always attended with a silent Convocation, as here it came to pass. The activity of the former in church-matters left the latter nothing to do." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 25.) A man would think by this, that the Parliament of this year, being the 23rd of the queen, had done great feats in matters of religion, as making new Articles of faith, or confirming Canons, or something else of like importance. But, for all this great cry we have little wool; our author taking notice of nothing else which was done this Parliament, but that it was made treason for the priests or Jesuits to seduce any of the queen's subjects to the Romish religion, and for the subjects to be reconciled to the church of Rome, with other matters not within the power and cognizance of the Convocation. But he conceals another Statute, as necessary to the peace and safety of the church and state as the other was; by which it was

<sup>\*</sup> "Conference," p. 80.

enacted, "that if any person or persons should advisedly devise, or write, print, or set forth any manner of book, rhyme, ballad, letter, or writing, containing any false, seditious, and slanderous matter, to the defamation of the queen's majesty, or to the encouraging, stirring, or moving of any insurrection or rebellion within this realm, &c. or that shall procure, or cause such book, rhyme, ballad, &c. to be written, printed, published, or set forth, &c. the offenders to suffer such pain of death and forfeiture as in case of felony."\* A Statute made of purpose to restrain the insolencies of the Puritan faction, and by which many of them were adjudged to death in the times ensuing: some as the authors, and others as the publishers, of seditious pamphlets. But being made with limitation to the life of the queen, it expired with her; and had it been revived (as it never was) by either of the two last kings, might possibly have prevented those dreadful mischiefs which their posterity is involved in.

"Sure I am it is most usual in the Court of the Marches, (Arches rather,) whereof I have the best experience." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 52.) This is according to the old saying, to correct *Magnificat*. Assuredly, archbishop Whitgift knew better what he was to write, than to need any such critical emendations. And therefore our author might have kept his "Arches" for some public triumph after his conquest of "the covetous Conformists and high royalists," which before we had. It was the Court of the Marches which the bishop speaks of, and of which he had so good experience; he being made Vice-President of the Court of the Marches by sir Henry Sidney, immediately on his first coming to the see of Worcester, as sir George Paul telleth us in his Life.

"By the changing of EDMOND into JOHN CANTUAR., it plainly appears, that, as all these letters were written this year, so they were indited after the 6th of July, (and probably about December,) when bishop Grindal deceased." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 59.) I grant it for a truth, that Grindal died on the 6th of July; and I know it also for a truth, that Whitgift was translated to the see of Canterbury on the 23rd of September then next following. But yet it follows not thereupon, that all the letters here spoken of, (being twelve in number,) which are here exemplified, were written in the compass of one year, and much less in so narrow a time as about December. Nay, the contrary hereunto appears by the letters themselves. For in one of them written to the Lord Treasurer, I find this passage, namely: "Your lordship objecteth, that it is said I took this course for the better maintenance of my book. My enemies say so, indeed; but I trust my friends have a better opinion of me. What should I look for any confirmation of my book after twelve years, or what should I get thereby more than already?" (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 56.) Now the book mentioned by the bishop was that entituled, "The Defence of the Answer to the

\* 23 Elizabeth, c. 2.

Admonition against the Reply of T. C." printed at London, *anno* 1574. To which the twelve years being added, which we find mentioned in this letter, it must needs be that this letter to the Lord Treasurer was written in the year 1586, and consequently not all written in the year 1583, as our author makes them. The like might be collected also from some circumstances in the other letters, but that I have more necessary business to employ my time on.

"The severe enforcing of subscription hereunto, what great disturbance it occasioned in the church, shall hereafter, by God's assistance, be made to appear; leaving others to judge whether the offence was given or taken thereby." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 68.) Our author tells us, that, in the business of church-government, he would "lie at a close guard, and offer as little play as might be, on either side." (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 35.) But, for all that, he cannot but declare himself for the stronger party. He had not else left it as a matter doubtful, whether the disturbances which ensued on the archbishop's enforcing of subscription, and the scandal which did thence arise, were to be imputed to the imposer, who had authority on his side, (as himself confesseth,) or the refusers, carried on by self-ends and untractable obstinacy. As for the Articles to which subscriptions were required, they were these that follow; namely,—

1. That the queen only had supreme authority over all persons born within her dominion.

2. That the Book of Common-Prayer and ordination of bishops, priests, and deacons, containeth nothing contrary to the word of God.

3. That the Articles of Religion agreed on in the year 1562, and published by the queen's authority, were consonant to the word of God.

All which, being so expressly built on the laws of the realm, must needs lay the scandal at their doors who refused subscription, and not at his who did require it. "But love will creep," they say, "where it cannot go." And do our author what he can, he must discover his affection to "the holy cause" upon all occasions. No where more manifestly than where he telleth us,—

FULLER.—It lieth not in the power of Parliament to make "new articles of faith;" nor did they ever pretend unto it. Nor lieth it in the power of the church to *make* any "new articles." Canons they may make, for the discipline; and may *declare and publish* "articles of faith." But God alone in Scripture hath *made* them; to which man, under a heavy curse, may make no addition. Our author proceeds:—

179. DR. HEYLIN.—"That since the High Commission, and this oath," (it is that *ex officio* which he meaneth,) "were taken away by the Act of Parliament, it is to be hoped, that (if such swearing were so great a grievance) *nihil analogum*, 'nothing like unto it' (which may amount to as much) shall hereafter be substituted in the room thereof." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 90.) What could be said more plain

to testify his disaffections one way, and his zeal another ? The High Commission and the oath reproached as grievances, because the greatest curbs of the Puritan party, and the strongest bulwarks of the church ; a congratulation to the times for abolishing both, though as yet I find no Act of Parliament against the oath, except it be by consequence and illation only ; and finally a hope expressed that the church never shall revert to her former power in substituting any like thing in the place thereof, by which the good people of the land may be stopped in their way to the fifth monarchy so much sought after. And yet this does not speak so plain as the following passage.

FULLER.—God restore the church in his good time to her just rights, and give her wisdom moderately to use them !

I am for no fifth-monarchy or first-anarchy men ; but desire from my heart, that no such analogical oath may be offered to me ; and let the Animadvertor, if desirous thereof, have it to himself, and much good may it do him ! Our author proceeds :—

180. DR. HEYLIN.—“ Wits will be working ; and such as have a satirical vein cannot better vent it than in lashing of sin.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 98.) This spoken in defence of those scurrilous libels which Job Throgmorton, Penry, Fenner, and the rest of the Puritan rabble published in print against the bishops, *anno* 1588, thereby to render them ridiculous both abroad and at home. The queen being first exclaimed against, and her honourable Council scandalously censured for opposing the Gospel, they fall more foully on the bishops, crying them down as “ antichristian, petty popes, bishops of the devil, cogging and cozening knaves, dumb dogs, enemies of God,” &c. For which cause much applauded by the papists beyond sea, (to whom nothing was more acceptable than to see the English hierarchy reproached and vilified,) and frequently cited by them as unquestioned evidences.

FULLER.—I am most disingenuously dealt with by the Animadvertor, obtruding on me such words : *In defence ?* I defy it ; these my words immediately following :—“ But the more discreet and devout sort of men, even of such as were no great friends to the hierarchy, upon solemn debate then resolved, (I speak on certain knowledge, from the mouths of such whom I must believe,) that, for many foul falsehoods therein suggested, such books were altogether unbeseeming a pious spirit to print, publish, or with pleasure peruse ; which, supposed true both in matter and measure, charity would rather conceal than discover ; the best of men being so conscious of their own badness, that they are more careful to wash their own faces, than busy to throw dirt on others. Any man may be witty in a biting way ; and those who have the dullest brains have commonly the sharpest teeth to that purpose. But such carnal mirth, whilst it tickleth the flesh doth wound the soul.

And, which was the main, these base books would give a great advantage to the general foe ; and papists would make too much use thereof against protestant religion ; especially seeing an arch-angel thought himself too good to bring, and Satan not bad enough to have brought, railing speeches against him, Jude 9." Reader, what could I have written more fully and freely in the cordial detestation of such abhominal \* libels ?

DR. HEYLIN.—For if our author's rule be good, "That the fault is not in the writer, if he truly cite what is false on the credit of another ;" (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 102 ;) they had no reason to examine punctually the truth of that which tended so apparently to the great advantage of their cause and party. But this rule, whether true or false, cannot be used to justify our author in many passages, though truly cited ; considering that he cannot choose but know them to be false in themselves. And he that knowing a thing to be false, sets it down for true, not only gives the lie to his own conscience, but occasions others also to believe a falsehood. And from this charge I cannot see how he can be acquitted in making the bishops to be guilty of those filthy sins, for which they were to be so "lashed by satirical wits," or imputing those base libels unto wanton wits, which could proceed from no other fountain than malicious wickedness.

FULLER.—I say again, "The writer is faultless, who truly cites what is false on the credit of another ;" always provided, that the other, who is quoted, hath credit, and be not a lying libeller, like these pasquils.

If this rule be not true, the Animadvertor will have a hard task of it to make good all in his "*Geography*" *on his own knowledge* ; who therein hath traded on trust, as much as another.

181. DR. HEYLIN.—But I am weary and ashamed of raking in so impure a kennel ; and for that cause also shall willingly pass over his apology for Hacket, that blasphemous wretch, and most execrable miscreant, justly condemned and executed for a double treason, against the King of kings in heaven, and the queen on earth.

FULLER.—I appeal to the reader, whether I have not in my Church-History wrote most bitterly and deservedly against him ; only I took occasion by Hacket's badness to raise our thankfulness to God. If my meat hercin please not the Animadvertor's palate, let him leave it in the dish ; none shall eat thereof against their own stomachs, for fear of a surfeit.

DR. HEYLIN.—Of whom he would not have us think, that "he and

\* This is one of Fuller's humorous exemplifications of verbal criticism, deriving our common word "abominable" from *ab* and *homo*, *hominis*, and thus converting it into the very expressive term *abhominal*, "unworthy of a man," "unmanly," "inhuman,"  
—EDIT.



his two companions" (his two prophets, for so they called themselves) "were worse by nature than all others of the English nation; the natural corruption in the hearts of others being not less headstrong, but more bridled;" and, finally, that "if God's restraining grace be taken from us, we shall all run unto the same excess of riot." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 114.) Which plea, if it be good for Hacket, will hold good for Judas; and pity it is, that some of our fine wits did never study an apology for him.

From Hacket he goes on to Travers, a man of an unquiet spirit, but not half so mischievous, of whom he saith,—

FULLER:— ——— Our author proceeds:—

182. DR. HEYLIN.—"At Antwerp he was ordained minister by the presbytery there," and, not long after that, "he was put in orders by the presbytery of a foreign nation." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 125, 126.) Here have we ordination, and putting into orders, ascribed to the presbytery of Antwerp; a mongrel company, consisting of two blue aprons to each crewel night-cap; and that too in such positive terms, and without any the least qualification, that no Presbyterian in the pack could have spoken more plainly. The man hath hitherto stood distracted betwixt shame and love; love to the cause, and shame to be discovered for a party in it, drawing several ways. *Pudor est qui suadeat illinc, hinc dissuadet amor*, in the poet's language. And, in this fit, he thought it good to "withdraw himself, or stand by as a silent spectator, that his betters might have room to come forth and speak in the present controversy of church-government." (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 35.) But here love carries it away, and he declares himself roundly for the Presbyterians, by giving them the power of ordination, and consequently of ecclesiastical censure in their several consistories. Had he used the words of the certificate, which he grounds upon, and told us that Travers was admitted by that presbytery to the ministry of the holy word, (*in sacro verbi Dei ministerio institutus*, as their words there are,) he had done the part of an historian. They may make ministers how and of whom they list, and put "that heavenly treasure" into what "vessels" they please. *Scripturarum ars est quam omnes passim sibi vindicant*, as St. Jerome complained in his time. Let every tradesman be a preacher, and step from the shop-board to the pulpit, if they think well of it. This may be called "a making of ministers," in such a sense as Phebe is said to be a minister of the church of Cenchrea, to minister to the necessities of their congregations. But to ascribe unto them a power of ordination, or of giving orders, which they assume not to themselves, savours too strong of the party, and contradicts the general rules of the ancient fathers. At this time I content myself with that saying of Jerome, because esteemed no friend to bishops; *viz. Quid facit episcopus, exceptâ ordinatione, quod presbyter non faciat?* and for the rest refer the reader to the learned treatise of Dr. Boke, entituled, "Observa-

tions upon the ordinance of the Lords and Commons at Westminster for the ordination of ministers *pro tempore*, printed at Oxford, 1644."

FULLER.—It is better to wear a crewel night-cap than a *cruel heart*, causelessly cavilling at every man.

Mr. Travers was ordained minister or priest by the presbytery of Antwerp, and never had other ordination. I only relate that it was so *de facto*; and appeal to the reader, whether my words import the least countenance and approbation thereof,—though the sin had not been so heinous, if I had so done.

DR. HEYLIN.—Only I shall make bold to quit my author with a merry tale, (though but one for an hundred,) and it is a tale of an old, jolly popish priest, who, having no entertainment for a friend who came to him on a fasting-day, but a piece of pork; and, making conscience of observing the appointed fast, dipped it into a tub of water, saying, "Down, pork! up, pike!" Satisfied with which device, (as, being accustomed to *transubstantiate*, he well might be,) he caused it to be put into the pot and made ready for dinner. But as the pork, for all this sudden piece of wit, was no other than pork; so these good fellows of the presbytery, by laying hands upon one another, act as little as he. The parties so imposed upon (*imposed upon*, indeed, in the proper notion) are but as they were, lay-brethren of the better stamp; *ministers*, if you will; but not *priests* nor *deacons*, nor any ways canonically enabled for divine performances.

FULLER.—It is not a fortnight since I heard proclamation against the selling of pork, because about London fatted with the flesh of diseased horses.

I suspect some unwholesomeness in the Animadvertor's pork-story, especially as applied; and therefore will not meddle therewith.

DR. HEYLIN.—But fearing to be chidden for this levity, I knock off again, following my author as he leads me; who, being over shoes, will be over boots also. He is so lost to "the high royalist and covetous Conformist," that he cannot be in a worse case (with them) than he is already.

FULLER.—If I be "lost with the *high* royalists and *covetous* Conformists," I hope I shall be found by the *low* royalists and *liberal* Conformists. However, may God be pleased to find my soul; and I pass not \* with whom I be lost.

There are a sort of men, who, with Dr. Manwaring, maintain that kings may impose without Parliaments what taxes they please, and the subjects bound to payment under pain of damnation; a principle introductory to tyranny and slavery. These I term "*high* royalists;" and I protest myself as to dissent in judgment from them, so not to be at all ambitious of their favour.

\* In the ancient meaning of, "I care not;" "I regard not."—EDIT.

DR. HEYLIN.—And therefore having declared himself for a presbyterian in point of government, he will go through with his work, showing himself a professed Calvinist in point of doctrine, and a strict Sabbatarian too in that single point, though therein differing (as the rest of that party do) from their master Calvin.

FULLER.—Where have I declared myself for a presbyterian in point of government? who never scattered syllable (and if I did, I would snatch it up again) to countenance such presumption.

I confess I said, that Mr. Travers was made minister or priest by the presbytery at Antwerp; that is, made minister so far forth as they could give, and he receive, the ministerial character, who never had it otherwise impressed upon him.

Suppose a disputable power should dub a knight; might not a historian say, Such a man was made a knight by such a power or person,—not engaging himself to justify his authority that made him? And, by the same proportion, I, relating Mr. Travers made minister at Antwerp, am not concerned to justify, nor by my expression do I any way approve, their *minister-making*, if they have no commission thereunto.

I cannot close with the Animadvertor in his uncharitable censure of the ministry of foreign protestant churches, rendering them utterly invalid, because ordained by no bishops. Cain (as commonly believed) is conceived to have killed a fourth part of mankind by murdering Abel; but the Animadvertor's cruelty to Protestants hath exceeded this proportion, in spiritually killing more than a fourth part of protestants, according to his own principles: for if no priests in France, Low Countries, Switzerland, &c. then no sacraments; then no church; then no salvation.

Far more charity in those of the former age. Bishop Andrews, when he concurred with others of his own order, in ordaining a Scottishman bishop, who (as by proportion of time may be demonstrated) received his deaconship and priesthood from the presbytery, conceived such ordination of validity *when done*; though, I believe, in his judgment not so well approving the doing thereof: otherwise he would never have consented to make a mere layman, *per saltum*, a bishop.

183—192. DR. HEYLIN.—First. For the sabbath, (for the better day the better deed,) having repeated the chief heads of Dr. Bound's book, published *anno* 1595, in which the sabbatarian doctrines were first set on foot, he adds, that "learned men were much divided in their judgments about the same."

"Some," saith he, "embraced them as ancient truths consonant to Scripture, long disused and neglected, now seasonably revived for the increase of piety." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 144.) Amongst which "some,"

he that shall take our author for one will not be much mistaken either in the man or in the matter. For that he doth approve Bound's doctrines in this particular, appears,

First. By a passage, (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 66,) where he concurs with him in reckoning the casual falling of the scaffolds at Paris-garden on the Lord's-day, *anno* 1583, for a divine judgment upon those who perished by it, as they were beholding that rude pastime.

Secondly. By his censure of the proceedings of archbishop Whitgift against these doctrines, of whom he telleth us, that "his known opposition to the proceedings of the Brethren rendered his actions more odious; as if out of envy he had caused such a pearl to be concealed." (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 145.)

Thirdly. By making these sabbath-doctrines to be "the diamond in the ring" of those catechisms and controversies which afterwards were set out by the stricter divines. (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 146.)

Fourthly. By the sadness which he finds in recounting "the grief and distraction occasioned in many honest men's hearts" by the several publishings of the "Declaration about lawful Sports." (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 270.)

But leaving him to stand or fall to his own master, I would fain know what text of Scripture, ancient writer, or approved council, can be brought to justify Bound's doctrines, which he affirms for ancient truths and consonant to holy Scripture; but more particularly where he can show me any ground for the third position; namely, "That there is as great reason why we Christians should take ourselves as straitly bound to rest upon the Lord's day as the Jews were upon their sabbath; it being one of the moral commandments, whereof all are of equal authority." This, if it be a truth, is no ancient truth; and whensoever it be received and allowed for truth, will in conclusion lay as heavy and insupportable burdens upon the consciences of God's people as ever were imposed upon the Jews by the scribes and pharisees. And, Secondly, I would fain know the meaning of the following words, in which it is said, that "others conceived them grounded on a wrong bottom; but, because they tended to the manifest advance of religion, it was pity to oppose them." I would fain know, I say, (considering that the foundation of the Christian faith is laid on the doctrine of the prophets and apostles, Christ himself being the chief corner-stone,) how anything which is not built upon this foundation, but "grounded on a wrong bottom," (as this seemed to be,) "could tend to the manifest advance of the true religion." That it tended to the manifest advance of some religion, I shall easily grant; and if our author mean no otherwise, we shall soon agree. But sure I am, no part of "the true religion" was ever grounded upon falsehood; and therefore if this doctrine were grounded on so ill a bottom as they say it was, it might conduce to the advancement of a faction and men's private interests, but to the true religion it was likely to contribute nothing but disgrace and scandal. Lastly. I am to mind our author,

that he makes Mr. Greenham's treatise of the Sabbath to be published in pursuance of Bound's opinions, which could not be till in or after the year 1595. Whereas he had laid him in his grave above two years before, telling us that "he died of the plague in London, *anno* 1592." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 132.) By which it seems that Greenham either writ this treatise after his decease ; or else our author hath done ill in giving the first honour of these new doctrines unto Dr. Bound. In the next place we shall see our author engage himself in defence of the Calvinian doctrines about predestination, grace, &c. of which he telleth us, that

Having much "troubled both the schools and pulpit, archbishop Whitgift, out of his Christian care to propagate the truth and suppress the opposite errors, caused a solemn meeting of many grave and learned divines at Lambeth." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 146.) The occasion this: The controversies about predestination, grace, &c. had been long agitated in the schools between the Dominicans on the one side and the Franciscans on the other ; the Dominicans grounding their opinion on the authority of St. Augustine, Prosper, and some others of the following writers ; the Franciscans, on the general current of the ancient Fathers, who lived *ante mota certamina Pelagiana*, "before the rising of the Pelagian heresies." Which disputes being after taken up in the Lutheran churches, "the moderate Lutherans" (as they call them) followed the doctrine of Melancthon, conformable to the Franciscans in those particulars. The others whom they call "the stiff or rigid Lutherans," of whom Flaccius Illyricus was the chief, go in the same way with the Dominicans. The authority of which last opinion, after it had been entertained and published in the works of Calvin, for his sake found admittance in the schools and pulpits of most of the Reformed churches. And having got footing here in England, by the preaching of such divines as had fled to Geneva in queen Mary's time, it was defended in the schools of Cambridge without opposition, till Peter Baro, a Frenchman, came and settled there ; who, being the lady Margaret's Professor in that University, and liking better of the Melancthonian way than that of Calvin, defended it openly in the schools ; many of parts and quality being gained unto his opinion. Which gave so much displeasure to Dr. Whitaker, Dr. Tyndal, Mr. Perkins, and some other leading men of the contrary judgment, that they thought best to use the argument *ab autoritate* to convince their adversaries ; and complained thereof to the archbishop, and in the end prevailed with him to call that meeting at Lambeth which our author speaks of: in which some Articles (commonly called "the Nine Articles of Lambeth") were agreed upon, and sent down to Cambridge in favour of Dr. Whitaker, and his associates. But our author, not content to relate the story of the quarrel, must take upon him also to be a judge in the controversy. He had before commended the Dominicans for their orthodoxy in these points of doctrine, as they were then in agitation betwixt them and the Franciscans. He now proceeds to

do the like between the two parties (men of great piety and learning appearing in it on both sides) disputing the same points in the church of England; honouring the opinion of Dr. Whitaker and his associates with the name of "the truth;" and branding the other with the title of "the opposite error." And yet, not thinking that he had declared himself sufficiently in the favour of the Calvinian party, he telleth us not long after of these Lambeth Articles, that "though they wanted the authority of provincial Acts, yet will they readily be received of all orthodox Christians for as far as their own purity bears conformity to God's word." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 150.) Which last words (though somewhat perplexedly laid down) must either intimate their conformity to the word of God, or else signify nothing. But whatsoever opinion our author hath of these "nine Articles," certain it is that queen Elizabeth was much displeased at the making of them, and commanded them to be suppressed, which was done accordingly; and with such diligence withal, that for long time a copy of them was not to be met with in that University. Nor was king James better pleased with them than queen Elizabeth was. Insomuch that when Dr. Reynolds moved, (in the Conference of Hampton-Court,) that the nine Articles of Lambeth might be superadded to the thirty-nine Articles of the church of England; king James, upon an information of the true state of the business, did absolutely refuse to give way to it. But of this more at large elsewhere. I only add a *memorandum* of our author's mistake in making Dr. Richard Bancroft, bishop of London, to be one of the bishops which were present at the meeting at Lambeth; whereas indeed it was Richard Fletcher, bishop elect of London, and by that name entituled in such authors as relate this story; Dr. Bancroft not being made bishop of London, or of any place else, till the year 1597, which was two years after this assembly. A like mistake relating to this business also, I find in "the History of Cambridge," about Dr. Baro, of whom our author tells us thus:—

"The end of Dr. Peter Baro's (the Margaret Professor's) triennial lectures began to draw near," &c. And not long after, "The University intended to cut him off at the just joint, when his three years should be expired." ("History of Cambridge," p. 213.) This shows our author, though well-travelled in other countries, to be but *peregrinus domi*, "a stranger in his own University;" in which the Margaret Professor is not chosen for "three years," but for two years only. And this appears plainly by the statutes of that foundation, the precise words whereof are these; namely, *Et volumus insuper quòd de cætero quolibet biennio ultimo die cessationis cujuslibet termini ante magnam vacationem Universitatis prædictæ, una habilis, apta, et idonea persona in Lectorem lecturæ prædictæ pro uno biennio integro, viz., a festo Nativitatis B. Mariæ virginis tunc proximè sequente duntaxat duraturo, eligatur.* (Fol. 105, in nigro codice.) For this I am beholding to the author of the pamphlet called "the Observator observed," and thank him for it. Which said, we shall close up this ninth book with



some considerations on these following words, which our author very ingenuously hath laid before us ; namely,—

“If we look now on the Nonconformists, we shall find all still and quiet ; who began now to repose themselves in a sad silence, especially after the execution of Udal and Penry had so terrified them, that, though they might have secret designs, we meet not their open and public motions.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 152.) And, to say truth, it was high time for them to change their course in which they had so often been foiled and worsted. The learned works of Dr. Bilson, (after bishop of Winchester,) in defence of the episcopal government, of Dr. Cosin, dean of the Arches, in maintenance of the proceedings in courts ecclesiastical ; with the two books of Dr. Bancroft, the one discovering the absurdities of the “pretended holy discipline,” the other their practices and positions to advance the same, gave the first check to their proceedings at the push of pen. All which being published, *anno* 1593, were seconded about two years after by the accurate and well-studied works of Richard Hooker, then Master of the Temple, and prebend of Canterbury ; in which he so asserted the whole body of the English Liturgy, and laid such grounds to found her polity upon, that he may justly be affirmed to have struck the last blow in this quarrel. But it was not so much the arguments of these learned men, as the seasonable execution of some principal sticklers, which occasioned the great calm both in church and state, not only for the rest of the queen’s time, but a long time after. For, besides that Cartwright, and some other of the principal and most active leaders, had been imprisoned and proceeded against in the court of Star-chamber ; the edge of the statute 23 Elizabeth, c. 2, which before we spake of,\* had made such terrible work amongst them, that they durst no longer venture on their former courses. Copping and Thacker hanged at St. Edmondsbury in Suffolk, Barrow and Greenwood executed at Tyburn, and Penry at St. Thomas of Waterings, Udal, Billot, Studley, and Boulter condemned to the same death, though at last reprieved, (not to say any thing of Hacket, with Coppinger and Arthington his two prophets, as more mad than the rest,) could not but teach them this sad lesson,—that it is no safe dallying with fire, nor jesting with edge tools. But there are more ways to the wood than one ; and they had wit enough to cast about for some other way, since the first had failed them. *Hac non successit, aliâ tentandum est viâ*, had been learned in vain, if not reducible to practice. So that it is no marvel if, after this, we find them not “in any public and open motion ;” when “wearied with their former blusterings,” and terrified with the sad remembrance of such executions, they betook themselves to secret and more dark designs. *Occultior Pompeius Cæsare, non melior*, as it is in Tacitus : “Pompey’s intentions were not less mischievous to the commonwealth than Cæsar’s were, but more closely carried.” And because closely carried, the more likely to have taken effect, had any but

\* See page 514.—EDIT.



Cæsar been the head of the opposite party. The fort that had been found impregnable by open batteries, hath been taken at last by undermining. Nor ever were the Houses of Parliament more like to have been blown up with gunpowder, than when the candle which was to give fire to it was carried by Faux in a dark lanthorn. Henceforward, therefore, we shall find the Brethren at another ward, practising their party underhand, working their business into a State-faction, and never so dangerously carrying on the plot as when least observed; till, in the end, when all preventions were let slip, and the danger grown beyond prevention, they brought their matters to that end which we shall find too evidently in the end of this History. To which before we can proceed, we must look back upon a passage of another nature, which, without interrupting the coherencies of the former Observations, could not be taken notice of and rectified in its proper place; and is this that followeth:—

FULLER.—The Animadvertor imposeth on me that which is contrary to my judgment.

I am not of Dr. Bound's opinion, who straineth the sabbath too high; yea, the Animadvertor, when writing against Mr. Le Strange, maketh use of above twenty lines out of my book against him.

I am of the judgment of moderate men, as I have clearly and largely stated it in my "Church-History;" and will live, and desire to die, in the maintenance thereof. And I hope the Animadvertor will allow me to know my own judgment better than he doth.

I am not of the Animadvertor's mind,—that the Lord's day is alterable and of mere ecclesiastical constitution; much less dare I concur with him in his scandalous expression, "that the late Parliament hath by their orders and ordinances laid greater restraints on people than ever the scribes and pharisees did on the Jews." \*

To what followeth in the Animadvertor concerning the Articles at Lambeth, I return no other answer, save this: As a historian, I have written truly for matter of fact; and if, as a divine, I have interposed something of my judgment in those points, I believe the Animadvertor, if writing on the same subject, would not appear more moderate. Meantime, I am sure he differs as much from me, as I from him, in these opinions; and, therefore, I see no reason of his animosity on this account. Our author proceeds:—

193. DR. HEYLIN.—"Queen Elizabeth, coming to the crown, sent for abbot Feckenham to come to her, whom the messenger found setting of elms in the orchard of Westminster Abbey. But he would not follow the messenger, till first he had finished his plantation." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 79.) The tale goes otherwise by tradition than is here delivered; and well it may. For who did ever hear of any elms in

\* In his "Advertisements on the History of King Charles," p. 64.

Westminster orchard ; or, to say truth, of any elms in any orchard whatsoever of a late plantation ? Elms are for groves, and fields, and forests, too cumbersome and overspreading to be set in orchards. But the tale goes, that abbot Feckenham, being busied in planting elms near his garden-wall, in the place now called the Dean's-yard, was encountered with one of his acquaintance, saying, " My lord, you may very well save your labour, the Bill for dissolving of your monastery being just now passed." To which the good old man, unmoved, returned this answer : " That he would go forwards howsoever in his plantation ; not doubting, though it pleased not God to continue it in the state it was, but that it would be kept and used as a seat of learning for all times ensuing." Which said, our author need not trouble himself with thinking " how his trees thrive at this day," as he seems to do ; he knows where to find them.

FULLER.—When a traveller on the highway suddenly returns back again, surely it is to fetch some matter of moment, which he hath forgotten and left behind him. The Animadvertor in this his note retreats above fifty pages in my " Church-History," namely, from page 144 to page 79. And what is this retrograde motion for ? Even to carp at elms, which I say were set by abbot Feckenham in the orchard of the dean of Westminster, citing my author, REXNERIUS, for the same ; whose words, *in horto*, I translate, " in the orchard," as more proper for elms than a garden. Thus have you my tale and my tale's maker. So that this wooden Animadversion might well have been spared.

---

## BOOK X.

CONTAINING THE REIGN OF KING JAMES.

194. DR. HEYLIN.—The Puritan clamours being hushed, and the papists giving themselves some hopes of better days, afforded king James a quiet entrance to the crown. But scarce was he warm upon the throne, but the Puritans assaulted him with their petitions ; and some of the papists, finding their hopes began to fail them, turned their private discontents into open practices, endeavouring to settle their religion by the destruction of the king, and the change of government. And, First, beginning with the papists, because first in time.

" Watson, with William Clark, (another of his own profession,) having fancied a notional treason, imparted it to George Brooke." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 169.) To these he after adds the lord Cobham a protestant, the lord Gray of Whaddon a puritan, and sir Walter Raleigh " an able statesman," and " some other knights."

In the recital of which names our author hath committed a double

fault, the one of omission, and the other of commission. *A fault of omission*, in leaving out sir Griffith Markham, as much concerned as any of the principal actors, designed to have been Secretary of Estate, had the plot succeeded; and finally arraigned and condemned at Winchester, as the others were.

FULLER.—I distinguish betwixt *total omission*, *express enumeration*, and *implicit inclusion*. Sir Griffith Markham cannot be said to be omitted by me, because included in that clause, “and some other knights.” Yea, this whole treason had not at all found any mention in my History, (not being bound to take cognizance thereof,) save for the two priests, who were engaged therein.

195—197. DR. HEYLIN.—*His fault of commission* is, his calling the lord Gray by the name of the lord Gray of Whaddon, (a fault not easily to be pardoned in so great an herald,) whereas, indeed, though Whaddon in Buckinghamshire was part of his estate, yet Wilton in Herefordshire was his barony and ancient seat; his ancestors being called lords Gray of Wilton, to difference them from the lord Gray of Reuthen, the lord Gray of Codnor, &c.

Having thus satisfied our author in this particular, I would gladly satisfy myself in some others concerning this treason: in which I find so many persons of such different humours and religions, that it is very hard to think how they could either mingle their interests, or unite their counsels. But discontentments make men fuel fit for any fire; and discontents had been on purpose put upon some of them, the more to estrange them from the king, and the king from them. And though I am not Œdipus enough for so dark a sphinx, yet others who have had more light into the businesses of that time, have made their discontents to grow upon this occasion:—Sir Robert Cecil, then principal Secretary to the Estate, fearing the great abilities of Raleigh, and being wearied with the troublesome impertinencies of Gray and Cobham, all which had joined with him in design against the earl of Essex their common enemy, had done their errand to king James, (whose counsels he desired to engross to himself alone,) before his coming into England. And the plot took so good effect, that when the lord Cobham went to meet the king as he came towards London, the king checked him (being then Warden of the Cinque Ports) for his absence from his charge in that dangerous time. The lord Gray was not looked upon in the court, as he had been formerly, there being no longer use of his rashness and precipitations. And the better to discountenance Raleigh, who had been captain of the guard to queen Elizabeth, the king bestowed that office on sir Thomas Erskine, then viscount Fenton, and captain of his guard in Scotland. All which being publicly observed, it was no hard matter for George Brooke to work upon the weak spirits of Gray and Cobham; (of whom the last was his brother, and the first his brother's special friend;) and by such artifices as he used in laying before them their disgraces, and showing them a way

to right themselves, to draw them into the confederacy with Clark and Watson. And it is possible that they, not being substantive enough to stand alone, might acquaint Raleigh with the plot, whose head was able to do more than all their hands. But of his actings in it, or consenting to it, when the parties were brought unto their trial, there appeared no proof, but that Cobham, in his confession taken before the Lords, had accused him of it; and that not only as an accessory, but a principal actor. But Cobham not being brought into the open court to justify his accusation face to face, as the custom is, it was thought a good argument by many that Raleigh was not so criminal in this matter as his enemies made him. And though found guilty by the jury on no other evidence than a branch of Cobham's confession, not so much as subscribed by his hand; yet all men were not satisfied in the manner of this proceeding; it being then commonly affirmed that Cobham had retracted his accusation, as since it hath been said and printed, that "in a letter written the night before his trial, and then sent to the Lords, he cleared Raleigh from all manner of treasons against the king or state." For which, consult the "Observations upon some particular Persons and Passages," &c. printed *anno* 1656.

But from the practices of the papists, which have led me thus far out of my way, it is now time that I proceed to the petition of the Puritans, presented to the king much about that time.

"This was called the Millenary Petition." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 172.) And it was called so, because given out to be subscribed by a thousand hands, though it wanted a fourth part of that number. More modest now than they had been in Penry's time, when, instead of one thousand, they threatened to bring a petition which should be presented by the hands of a hundred thousand. More modest also in the style and phrase of their petition, and in the subject-matter of it, than they had been when Martin Mar-prelate ruled the roast, and would be satisfied with nothing but the ruin of the English hierarchy. Which notwithstanding, the king thought fit to demur upon it, and recommended the answering of their petition to the University of Oxford, and [it] was done accordingly. The answer and petition, printed not long after, gave the first stop to this importunity; repressed more fully by the Conference at Hampton-Court; of which it is told us by our author, how some of the Millenary party complained that—

FULLER.—A fault not so great neither in an herald, seeing I call him not "lord Gray, *baron* of Whaddon," but of *Whaddon*; and a noble person may be additioned either from his honour or his habitation. Besides Wilton in Herefordshire long since being run into ruin, those lords, some sixscore years ago, removed their residence to Whaddon in Bucks, where some of them lived, died, and are buried.

The Animadvertor made as great an omission in his "Short View of King Charles," when mentioning his tutor Mr. Murray,

but quite leaving out sir James Fullerton, conjoined with him in the same charge of the prince's education. And a greater fault of *commission* is he guilty of, when taxing Mr. Murray as disaffected to the English church; who, when made Provost of Eaton, took his oath, and therein professed his good liking of our discipline, as in the "Cabala" doth appear.

To return to Whaddon: the Animadvertor might have spared this his note, who, in the Postscript annexed to this book,\* maketh Edward lord Montague created baron of Broughton in Northamptonshire. Now, though the lord Montague hath the manor of Broughton, (with the appendant advowson,) and other considerable lands therein; yet is he baron of Boughton in the same county. A mistake so much the greater in the Animadvertor, because done in his *emendation* of his emendations of the faults of another, so that he cannot hit it right in this his third endeavour. This I had passed over in silence, had not his cruelty on my pen- or press-slips occasioned me to take notice thereof. Our author proceeds:—

198—202. DR. HEYLIN.—"This Conference was partially set forth only by Dr. Barlow, dean of Chester, their professed adversary, to the great disadvantage of their divines." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 193.) If so, how did it come to pass, that none of their divines then present, nor any other in their behalf, did ever manifest to the world the partialities and falsehoods of it? The book was printed not long after the end of the Conference, publicly passing from one hand to another, and never convicted of any such crime as it stands charged with, in any one particular passage, to this very day. Only it pleased some of the zealots to scatter abroad some trifling papers, not amounting to half a sheet amongst them, which tended to the holding-up of their sinking party; and, being brought by Dr. Barlow, were by him put in print and published at the end of his book, *ut deterrimâ comparatione gloriam sibi compararet*, in the words of Tacitus. He could not better manifest his own abilities, than by having those weak and imperfect scribbles for a foil unto them. And here, before I leave this Conference, I must make a start to Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 293, for rectifying a mistake of our author's, which relates unto it: where, speaking of Dr. King, then bishop of London, and reciting the course both of his preferments and employments, he telleth us, that, soon after the king's coming to the crown, "he was made dean of Christ-Church in Oxon, and chosen one of the four preachers in the Conference at Hampton-Court." But, First, Dr. King was not dean of Christ-Church at the time of the Conference at Hampton-Court; that Conference being held in January, *anno* 1603, and Dr. King not coming to the deanery of Christ-Church till the year 1605. Secondly. He was none of the four preachers in the Conference at Hampton-Court, there being no such preachers

\* Page 2, line 14.

chosen for the time of that Conference. But as it is a true and old saying, that *omnis fabula fundatur in historia* ; so I may say, that there was something true and real, which might carry him inadvertently upon this error. For in September, *anno* 1606, it pleased king James to call before him at Hampton-Court the Melvins, and some other of the principal sticklers for presbytery of the Scottish nation. For information of whose judgment, and reducing them, if possible, to some conformity, he caused four sermons to be there preached in their hearing, by four of his most able divines ; that is to say, Dr. Andrews, then bishop of Chichester ; Dr. Barlow, (before-mentioned,) then bishop of Rochester ; Dr. King, then dean of Christ-Church, after bishop of London ; and Dr. Buckeridge, who after succeeded in the see of Rochester, and died bishop of Ely. Which four sermons, being afterwards printed and bound together, though they gave very good satisfaction to most persons else, could get no ground upon those refractory Scots, who were resolved aforehand not to “hear the voice of those charmers, charmed they never so sweetly.”

“Indeed, a statute had formerly been made, the thirteenth of queen Elizabeth, which, to prevent final alienation of church-land, did disable all subjects from accepting them : but in that statute a liberty was left unto the Crown to receive the same.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 201.) Our author speaks this on occasion of a statute made in the first Parliament of king James, by which the king and his successors were made incapable of receiving any grants or leases of lands, from any archbishops, or bishops, for longer than twenty-one years, or three lives. But he is much mistaken in the grounds of it. For, First, the statute he relates unto was not made in the thirteenth year of the queen ; that statute extending only unto deans and chapters, masters of Colleges and Hospitals, as also unto parsons and vicars, who by long leases had dilapidated the public patrimony of the church, and their several houses : not a word in it which concerns archbishops and bishops, or any leases by them made. And, Secondly, that statute, whatsoever it be, doth not disable all subjects from accepting such leases, grants, and alienations, but disableth the said archbishops and bishops from making such grants unto the subjects. But the truth is, that statute which our author means is an unprinted statute made in the first year of queen Elizabeth ; by which it was enacted, “that it should be lawful for the said queen, as often as any archbishopric or bishopric should be vacant, to take unto herself any of the castles, manors, lands, tenements, and hereditaments to the same belonging, and to pay the said archbishop or bishop in impropriations, tithes, and portions of tithes.” And this is that statute which our author relates unto, Ch. Hist. vol. ii. p. 468, where it is said, that “a Bill passed for the assurance of certain lands assumed by the queen from some bishoprics during their vacation.” And, Secondly, it was enacted in the said unprinted statute, “that it should not be lawful for any archbishop or bishop to grant any lands, leases, or estates for more than twenty-one



years, or three lives, to any person whatsoever, except it were unto the queen, her heirs and successors ;” which last words opened such a gap to sacrilege and rapine, that what the queen thought fit to leave unto the church, *vacante sede*, the courtiers would find some way to divest it of, by making use of this last clause, first in obtaining such a grant to be made to the queen, and then from the queen unto themselves : so that our author might have saved his advocating for this clause of that Act, considering that he saw the ill consequents and effects thereof.

“Some of the greatest prelates, (how much self is there in all men!) though seemingly forward, really remiss in the matter.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 240.) This spoken in relation to Chelsea College ; the stop whereof must be imputed to some great prelates, fearing to grow less, both in esteem, power, and jurisdiction, if that work went forwards. Contrary whereunto he telleth us of archbishop Bancroft, that he was very forward “in founding Chelsea College, which, as a two-edged sword, was to cut on both sides,—to suppress papists and sectaries.” (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 245.) Upon which grounds there is no question to be made but that the work was furthered also by the rest of the bishops,—at the least not hindered. Our author hath indeed afforded us this marginal note ; namely, “This obstruction signifies nothing to discreet men ; however, it must pass for company-sake.” But it had argued more discretion in him, as I conceive, to have left this obstruction, as he calls it, out of his discourse, than, first, to break the bishops’ heads, and then give them this plaster.

FULLER.—I only said, that some “did *complain* that this Conference was partially set forth.” I avowed not that they complained justly ; I believe their complaint causeless, (and let it be remediless for me,) seeing I myself profess, *verbo sacerdotis*, that I have been accused that I have abridged this Conference to the disparagement of Dr. Reynolds, though my conscience be clear herein.

203—205. DR. HEYLIN.—“Howsoever,” our author telleth us, that “he” (namely, Mr. Nicholas Fuller) “left behind him the reputation of an honest man.” (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 243.) No question of it. It is a thing so incident to the name, that whatsoever they do or say, they are honest still.

FULLER.—All his jeering on my name shall not make me go to the herald’s office to endeavour the altering thereof. I fetched it from my great-great grand-father, and hope shall leave it to my great-great grand-child ; a name which no doubt originally was taken from that useful trade, without which mankind can neither be warm nor cleanly.

The like is frequent in many respectful families in England, as the antiquary hath observed :—



“ From whence came SMITH, albe he knight or squire,  
But from the smith that forgeth at the fire ? ” \*

Yet, considering the narrowness of my name, it is inferior to few, having produced the best of English pilots, Thomas Fuller, who steered captain Cavendish round about the world ; the best of English critics, Nicholas Fuller, so famous in foreign parts for his “ Miscellanies ; ” and none of the worst of English benefactors, John Fuller, one of the Judges of the Sheriff’s Court in London, who built and endowed an almshouse for twelve poor men at Stoken-heath, and another at Shoreditch for as many poor women.† Besides, he gave his lands and tenements of great yearly valuation in the parishes of St. Bene’t, and Peter’s Paul’s wharf, London, to feoffees in trust, to release prisoners in the hole of both compters, whose debts exceeded not twenty shillings eight-pence. Yea, it‡ hath at this day, one Bishop, one Dean, one Doctor, two Bachelors of Divinity, and many Masters of Arts, of no contemptible condition. Pardon, reader, this digression done *se defendendo* against one, by whom my name is too much under-valued, by ironical over-valuing thereof.

DR. HEYLIN.—Before, we had the story of Thomas Fuller of Hammersmith, condemned for felony, but still so honest and so entirely beloved by king Harry VI. after his decease, that he appeared to him on the top of the gallows, encouraged him, and so charmed the rope, that it did not strangle him. (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 535.)

Afterwards we meet with John Fuller, doctor of the laws, (a better than he,) a persecutor in queen Mary’s days, but “ a pitiful man,” as the index telleth us.

Here we have Nicholas Fuller, a counsellor, (the best of the three,) decrying openly the authority of the High Commission, and thereby giving “ a legal advantage to archbishop Bancroft,” by whom imprisoned ; and there dying, but dying with “ the reputation of an honest man.”

And then another Thomas Fuller, a minister, (the best of all the company,) and an honest man too, so well deserving of the church,

\* VERSTEGAN “ Of decayed Intelligence.” † STOW’S “ Survey of London,” page 97.

‡ In this passage the pronoun “ it ” refers to Fuller’s name, of which he here makes such laudable mention. The bishop who is intended, and who at that time flourished, seems to have been Dr. William Fuller, (born in London,) then most probably bishop elect of Limerick, who was translated in 1667 to the bishopric of Lincoln, and who by some writers is reputed to have been uncle to our author ;—the dean, Dr. William Fuller, (born at Hadleigh, in Suffolk,) promoted to the deanery of Ely in 1636, and in 1645 to that of Durham ;—the doctor was not Fuller himself, but one of his name ;—the two Bachelors of Divinity were probably himself and one of his near kindred ;—and among the latter might also be some of the many Masters of Arts to whom he refers.—EDIT.

and all good churchmen, (both alive and dead,) by this notable History, as not to doubt of the like favour at their hands (should there be occasion) as Thomas of Hammersmith received of king Harry VI.

“I am credibly informed, from a good hand, how, in the days of king James, a Scotchman and a prevalent courtier had swallowed up the whole bishopric of Durham, had not this archbishop seasonably interposed his power with the king, and dashed the design.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 245.) Credible though the information were, yet it was not true; there being no such prevalent courtier, nor no such design. It is true, the stomachs of the Scots were sharp set, still crying, “Give, give!” but never satisfied; king James as bountiful and open-handed towards them as they could desire. But neither were they so impudent as to crave, nor the king so impotent as to give, a whole bishopric at once, especially so rich a bishopric as this of Durham. But the truth is, that George Hume, earl of Dunbar, Lord Treasurer of Scotland, and highly favoured by the king, having procured a grant of all the batable grounds, as they then called them, upon the borders of both kingdoms, began to cast his eye upon Norham Castle and the lands about it, belonging to the See of Durham, conceiving it a fit place to command the rest. But being a well-principled man, and a great minister of that king’s in restoring the episcopal government to the church of Scotland, he acquainted bishop Bancroft with his desires; who knowing what great use might be made of him for the good of this church, and being sure enough of the consent of Dr. Matthews, then bishop of Durham, he thus ordered the business: whereas the revenue of Norham Castle, and the lands adjoining, were valued at one hundred twenty pounds *per annum* in the bishop’s rental, it was agreed, [First,] That the earl should procure of the king an abatement of six score pounds yearly out of the annual pension of a thousand pounds which had been laid upon that bishopric by queen Elizabeth, as before is said. Secondly. That he should obtain from the king, for the said Dr. Matthews and his successors, a restitution of his house in the Strand called Durham-house, with the gardens, stables, and tenements thereto appertaining, which had been alienated from that bishopric ever since the dissolving of it by king Edward VI. Thirdly. That, in consideration hereof, bishop Matthews should make a grant of Norham Castle, and the country adjoining, in fee-farm to the king, by him immediately to be conveyed to the earl of Dunbar. And, Fourthly, that, his own turn being thus served, the said earl should join with bishop Bancroft, and his friends, for obtaining from the king an Act of Parliament, whereby both he and his successors should be made incapable of any the like grants and alienations for the time to come; which as it was the best market that ever Toby Matthews was at, so was it the best bargain which was ever driven for the church of England; so far from “swallowing up that bishopric,” that it was the only means to save that, and preserve

the rest. And yet perhaps "the credible information" which our author speaks of, might not relate unto the bishopric, but the deanery of Durham, bestowed by that king (being then not well-studied in the composition of the church of England) on sir Adam Newton, "a courtier prevalent" enough, as having been tutor to prince Henry, the king's eldest son. And possible it is, that the Scots might have kept it in their hands from one generation to another, if Dr. Hunt (not otherwise to be remembered) had not bought him out of it, and put himself into the place.

FULLER.—Here are four gradations of FULLERS,—*good, better, best, best of all*; which, in the language of jeering, (speaking always by the contraries,) amounteth unto *bad, worse, worst, worst of all*.

As for the first, Thomas Fuller, I answer: First. The tale is not made, but related by me, who have charged my margin with the author thereof, Harpsfield,\* not inconsiderable for learning and religion amongst his own party. Secondly. Not the least credit is given thereunto in my reporting it, matching it with another miracle, which I call "equally true;" that is, *equally untrue*, in the interpretation of any impartial reader. Thirdly. Seeing I followed Harpsfield in relating his miracles in other places, if here I should have deserted him, probably it would have been by others condemned in me for a *sullen omission*, as by the Animadvertor for a *light insertion*, because Thomas Fuller was my namesake.

The good-nature and pitiful disposition of Dr. John Fuller plainly appeareth in Mr. Fox; and as for his bounty to Jesus College in Cambridge, I leave it to some of that foundation to give testimony thereof.

As for the third, Nicholas Fuller, be it reported to the JESSE† of Gray's-Inn, (I mean such benchers as pass amongst them for old men, and can distinctly remember him,) whether he hath not left a precious and perfumed memory behind him, of one pious to God, temperate in himself, able in his profession, moderate in his fees, careful for his client, faithful to his friend, hospitable to his neighbour, pitiful to the poor, and bountiful to Emmanuel College in Cambridge; in a word, blameless in all things, save this one act of indiscretion, which could not make him forfeit the reputation of his honesty, especially seeing he paid dear for it, and died in durance. Thus, though Mr. Stubbs was so obnoxious to the displeasure of queen Elizabeth, that his right hand was cut off, for writing a libel against her match with Monsieur; yet Mr. Camden does call him *virum famæ integerrimæ*.‡

\* *Hist. Ecclesiastica, seculo decimo-quinto*, p. 646.

† 1 Sam. xvii. 12.

‡ In his "Elizabeth," anno 1581.

For the fourth and last, I will make the Animadvertor the self-same answer which the servants of Hezekiah returned to Rabshakeh: "But they held their peace, and answered him not a word." (Isaiah xxxvi. 21.)

206—210. DR. HEYLIN.—"And as, about this time, some perchance overvalued the Geneva notes, out of that especial love they bare to the authors and place whence it proceeded; so, on the other side, some without cause did slight, or rather without charity did slander, the same." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 247, 248.) I trow, our author will not take upon him to condemn all those who approve not of the Genevian notes upon the Bible, or to appear an advocate for them; though he tells us, not many lines before, that "they were printed thirty times over with the general liking of the people."

FULLER.—Had I said "two-and-thirty times," though past the head game, I had not been out. And now the reader shall have my full and free sense of the Genevian notes. I remember the proverb:—

Πολύποδος κεφαλῇ ἐνὶ μὲν κακὸν εἶναι καὶ ἐσθλόν.\*

"In head of Polypus is had  
What is good, and what is bad."

Such a mixture is in these notes, wherein the most [are] pious and proper to expound their respective places; but some (and those too many, though never so few) false, factious, dangerous, yea, destructive to religion. I could therefore wish some godly and discreet persons [were] empowered and employed to purge forth the latttr, that the rest may remain without danger, for the profit of plain people. But till this be done, I am (I thank God) old enough to eat fish, feeding on the flesh thereof, and laying by the bones on my trencher, or casting them down to the dogs.

DR. HEYLIN.—I hope he will not condemn all those who approve not those notes; for king James, who, in the Conference at Hampton-Court, did, First, declare that of all the translations of the Bible into the English tongue, "that of Geneva was the worst;" and, Secondly, that the notes upon it were "partial, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous and traitorous conceits." For proof whereof his majesty instanced in two places: the one on Exod. i. 19; where disobedience to the king is allowed of: the other in 2 Chron. viii. 15, 16, where "Asa is taxed for deposing his mother only, and not killing her:" a note, whereof the Scottish Presbyterians made special use, not only deposing Mary their lawful queen from the regal throne, but prosecuting her openly and underhand, till they had taken away her life. These instances our author, in his summary of that Confer-

ence, hath passed over in silence, as loath to have such blemishes appear in the Genevians, or their Annotations ; and I hope also that he will not advocate for the rest.

FULLER.—Down with these bones to the dogs indeed ! which alone are proper for their palate. The Scots are old enough ; (being reputed by historians one of the most ancient nations of Europe ;) “let them answer for themselves :” though (I believe) they cannot answer this foul fact, but by penitent confession thereof. But whereas the Animadvertor taxeth me for wilfully omitting those instances of king James in favour to the Genevians ; I protest my integrity therein. It was only because I would have my summary a summary,—no abridgment being adequate to the narration abridged therein.

DR. HEYLIN.—For let him tell me what he thinks of that on the second of St. Mathew’s Gospel, verse 12 ; namely, “Promise ought,” &c.

FULLER.—Let him show me what commission he hath to inquire into my thoughts. However, to do him a pleasure, I will tell him what I think in the point.

DR. HEYLIN.—“Promise,” say the Genevians, in their note, Mat-  
thew ii. 12, “ought not to be kept where God’s honour and preaching of his truth is hindered, or else it ought not to be broken.” What a wide gap, think we, doth this open to the breach of all promises, oaths, covenants, contracts, and agreements, not only betwixt man and man, but between kings and their subjects ! What rebel ever took up arms without some pretences of that nature ? What tumults and rebellions have been raised in all parts of Christendom, in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, the Netherlands, Germany, (and, indeed, where not ?) under colour that “God’s honour, and the preaching of the truth, is hindered ?” If this once pass for good, sound doctrine, neither the king nor any of his good subjects, in what realm soever, can live in safety. “God’s honour and the preaching of his truth” are two such pretences, as will make void all laws, elude all oaths, and thrust out all covenants and agreements, be they what they will.

FULLER.—First. I behold this note as impertinent to that place ; seeing it appears not in the text that those wise men made Herod any promise to return unto him. Secondly. Had they made him any promise, yea, bound it with an oath *by the living God*, such an oath had not been obligatory, because God (to whom the forfeiture was due) released the band in an extraordinary vision unto them, such that our age doth not produce.

As the note is impertinent in that place, so it is dangerous at all times ; and man’s corruption may take thence too much mischievous advantage, which is partly given, because so perilous a pit

is left open, (contrary to the judicial law, Exod. xxi. 33,) and not covered over with due caution requisite thereunto. I concur therefore with the Animadvertor in the just dislike thereof.

DR. HEYLIN.—Next I would have our author tell me, what he thinks of this note, on the ninth of the Revelation, verse 3, where the locusts which came out of the smoke are said to be “false teachers, heretics, and worldly subtile prelates, with monks, friars, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, Doctors, Bachelors, and Masters?” Does not this note, apparently, fasten the name of “locusts” on all the clergy of this realm; that is to say, archbishops, bishops, and all such as are graduated in the University by the name of Doctors, Bachelors, and Masters? And doth it not as plainly yoke them with friars, monks, and cardinals, principal instruments in all times to advance the popedom? I know the words which follow after are alleged by some to take off the envy of this note, namely, “who forsake Christ to maintain false doctrines.” But the enumeration of so many particulars makes not the note the less invidious, the said explication notwithstanding; because the note had been as perfect and significant, had it gone thus in generals only, that is to say, “By *locusts* here are meant false teachers, heretics, and other worldly, subtile men, that seduced the people, persuading them to forsake Christ, to maintain false doctrines.” But the Genevians, who account archbishops and bishops to be limbs of the pope, resolved to join them with the rest of his members, friars, monks, and cardinals; and our author, being a great favourer of the Presbyterians, must not take notice of this scandal: especially considering that papacy and prelacy are joined together, in the language of the present times, and therefore fit to go together in this annotation.

“In this Parliament Dr. Harsnet, bishop of Chichester, gave offence in a sermon preached at court, pressing the word *Reddite Cæsari quæ sunt Cæsaris*, as if all that was levied by subsidies, or paid by custom to the Crown, was but a *redditum* of what was the king’s before.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 261.) This Parliament is placed by our author in the year 1613; but that Parliament, in the sitting whereof bishop Harsnet preached the sermon above-mentioned, was held by prorogation in the year 1609, and afterwards dissolved by proclamation in December of the year next following. Concerning which sermon king James gives this account to the Lords and Commons assembled before him at Whitehall, March 23rd:—

“And therefore,” saith he, “that reverend bishop here amongst you, though I hear by divers he was mistaken, or not well understood, yet did he preach both learnedly and truly ancient this point concerning the power of a king: for what he spake of a king’s power *in abstracto* is most true in divinity; for to emperors or kings, that are monarchs, their subjects’ bodies and goods are due, for their defence and maintenance. But if I had been in his place, I would only have added two

words which would have cleared all : for after I had told as a divine what was due by the subjects to their kings in general, I would then have concluded as an Englishman, showing this people, that, as in general all subjects were bound to relieve their king, so to exhort them that, as we lived in a settled state of a kingdom that was governed by his own fundamental laws and orders, that according thereunto they were now (being assembled for this purpose in Parliament) to consider how to help such a king as now they had, and that according to the ancient form and order established in this kingdom ; putting so a difference between the general power of a king in divinity, and the settled and established state of this crown and kingdom : and I am sure that the bishop meant to have done the same, if he had not been straitened by time, which, in respect of the greatness of the present preaching before us, and such an auditory, he durst not presume upon."

So that the doctrine of the bishop being thus justified and explained by king James, and the Parliament continuing undissolved till December following, we have no reason to believe that the Parliament was dissolved upon this occasion ; and much less on the occasion of some words spoken in that Parliament by bishop Neile : of which thus our author :—

"Likewise Dr. Neile, bishop of Rochester, uttered words in the House of Lords, interpreted to the disparagement of some reputed zealous patriot in the House of Commons." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 261.) In this passage I have many things to except against : as, 1. That this patriot is not named, to whose disparagement the words are pretended to be uttered. And, 2. That the words themselves are not here laid down, and yet are made to be so heinously taken that, to save the bishop from the storm which was coming towards him, the king should principally be occasioned to dissolve that Parliament. 3. That Dr. Neile is here called bishop of Rochester, whom, twice before, (namely, *Idem*, pp. 255, 260,) he makes to be bishop of Coventry and Lichfield. And, 4. That the words here intimated should be spoken in Parliament, *anno* 1613 ; whereas, by giving Dr. Neile the title of Rochester, it should rather be referred to the Parliament holden by prorogation till the last of December, *anno* 1610, when it was dissolved ; and then dissolved, as appears by the king's proclamation, for not supplying his necessities, and other reasons there expressed, whereof this was none.

"Some conceive, that in revenge Mr. John Selden soon after set forth his book of tithes, wherein he historically proveth, that they were payable *jure humano*, and not otherwise." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 264.) Whether the acting of the comedy called *Ignoramus* might move Mr. Selden at the first to take this revenge, I inquire not here, though it be probable it might ; that comedy being acted before king James, *anno* 1614, and this book coming out about two years after, *anno* 1616. But here I shall observe, in the first place, our author's partiality, in telling us that "Mr. Selden in that book hath proved



historically that tithes are payable *jure humano*, and not otherwise ;” whereas, indeed, he undertook to prove that point, but proved it not ; as will appear to any which have read the answers set out against him. I observe, Secondly, our author’s ignorance in the book itself, telling us, within few lines after, that “the first part of it is a mere Jew, of the practice of tithing amongst the Hebrews ; the second a Christian, and chiefly an Englishman ;” whereas, indeed, that part thereof which precedes the manner of tithing amongst Christians, hath as much of the Gentile as of the Jew, as much time spent upon examining of the tithes paid by the Greeks and Romans as was in that amongst the Hebrews. Thirdly. I must observe the prejudice which he hath put upon the cause, by telling us in the next place, that “though many divines undertook the answer of that book, yet sure it is, that never a fiercer storm fell on all parsonage-barns since the Reformation than what this treatise raised up.” And so our author leaves this matter without more ado, telling us of the church’s danger, but not acquainting us at all with her deliverance from the present storm ; neither so violent, nor so great, nor of such continuance, as to blow off any one tile, or to blow aside so much as one load of corn, from any parsonage-barn in England. For though this History gave some country gentlemen occasion and matter of discourse against paying tithes, yet it gave none of them the audaciousness to deny the payment ; so safe and speedy a course was taken to prevent the mischief : which since our author hath not told us, (as, had he played the part of a good historian, he was bound to do,) I will do it for him :—

“No sooner was the church’s patrimony thus called in question, but it pleased God to stir up some industrious and learned men to undertake the answering of that History, which at the first made so much noise amongst the people. Dr. Tillesly, archdeacon of Rochester, first appeared in the lists, managing that part of the controversy which our author calls ‘a Christian and an Englishman,’ relating to old chartularies and infeodations. The three first chapters which Dr. Tillesly had omitted, concerning the payment of tithes by the Jews and Gentiles, were solidly, but very smartly, examined and confuted by Mr. Mountagu, at that time Fellow of Eaton College, and afterwards lord bishop of Chichester ; as, finally, the two first chapters about the tithing of the Jews were learnedly reviewed by Mr. Nettles, a country minister, but excellently well skilled in Talmudical learning. In which encounters the Historian was so galled by Tillesly, so gagged by Mountagu, and stung by Nettles, that he never came off in any of his undertakings with such loss of credit. In the preface to his History, he had charged the clergy with ‘ignorance and laziness ;’ upbraided them with having nothing to keep up their credit but beard, habit, and title ; and that their studies reached no further than the Breviary, the Postils, and the Polyanthea. But now he found, by these encounters, that some of ‘the ignorant and lazy clergy’ were of as retired studies

as himself, and could not only match, but overmatch, him too in his own philology.

“But the governors of the church went a shorter way, and, not expecting till the book was answered by particular men, resolved to seek for reparation of the wrong from the author himself, upon an information to be brought against him in the High Commission. Fearing the issue of the business, and understanding what displeasures were conceived against him by the king and the church, he made his personal appearance in the open court at Lambeth on the eight-and-twentieth day of January, *anno* 1618; where, in the presence of George lord archbishop of Canterbury, John lord bishop of London, Lancelot lord bishop of Winchester, John lord bishop of Rochester; sir John Benet, sir William Bird, sir George Newman, Doctors of the Laws, and Thomas Mothershed, notary and register of that court, he tendered his submission and acknowledgment, all of his own handwriting, in these following words:—

*‘My good lords, I most humbly acknowledge my error which I have committed in publishing The History of Tithes, and especially in that I have at all, by showing any interpretation of holy Scriptures, by meddling with Councils, Fathers, or Canons, or by whatsoever occurs in it, offered any occasion of argument against any right of maintenance jure divino of the ministers of the Gospel; beseeching your lordships to receive this ingenuous and humble acknowledgment, together with the unfeigned protestation of my grief, for that through it I have so incurred both his majesty’s and your lordships’ displeasure conceived against me in behalf of the church of England.*

*‘JOHN SELDEN.’*

“Which his submission and acknowledgment being received, and made into an Act of Court, was entered into the public registers thereof, by this title following; *viz. Officium Dominorum contra Johannem Selden de Inter. Templo London. Armigerum.*”

So far our author should have gone, (had he played the part of a good historian,) but that he does his work by halves in all church-concernments.

“James Montague, bishop of Winchester, a potent courtier, took exceptions that his bishopric, in the marshalling of them, was wronged in the method, as put after any whose bishop is a privy counsellor.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 267.) The bishop was too wise a man to take this (as our author states it) for a sufficient ground of the proceeding against Dr. Mocket, who had then newly translated into the Latin tongue the Liturgy of the church of England, the Thirty-nine Articles, the Book of the Ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and many doctrinal points extracted out of the Book of Homilies: all which, with bishop Jewel’s “Apology,” Mr. Nowel’s “Catechism,” and a new book of his own entituled, *Politia Ecclesiæ*

*Anglicanæ*, he had caused to be printed and bound up together: a book which might have been of great honour to the church of England amongst foreign nations, and of no less use and esteem at home, had there not been somewhat else in it which [more] deserved the fire than this imaginary quarrel. For, by the Act of Parliament 31 Henry VIII. c. 10, the precedence of the bishops is thus marshalled; that is to say, the archbishop of Canterbury, the archbishop of York, the bishop of London, the bishop of Durham, the bishop of Winchester, the rest according to the order of their consecrations; yet so, that if any of them were Secretary to the king, he should take place of all those other bishops to whom otherwise, by the order of his consecration, he had been to give it. If the doctor did mistake himself in this particular, (as indeed he did,) the fault might easily have been mended, as not deserving to be expiated by so sharp a punishment. The following reason touching his derogating from the king's power in ecclesiastical matters, and adding it to the metropolitan whose servant and chaplain he was, hath more reason in it, (if it had but as much truth as reason,) and so hath that touching the propositions by him gathered out of the Homilies, which were rather framed according to his own judgment, than squared by the rules of the church. But that which I conceive to have been the true cause why the book was burned, was, that, in publishing the twentieth Article concerning "the Authority of the Church," he totally left out the first clause of it; viz. *Habet ecclesia ritus sive ceremonias statuendi jus et in controversiis fidei auctoritatem*. By means whereof the Article was apparently falsified, the church's authority disavowed, and consequently a wide gap opened to dispute her power, in all her Canons and determinations of what sort soever. And possible enough it is, that some just offence might be taken at him for making the fasting-days appointed in the Liturgy of the church of England to be commanded and observed *ob politicas solum rationes*, "for politic considerations only," as insinuated, page 308; whereas those fasting-days were appointed in the first Liturgy of king Edward VI. *anno* 1549, (with reference only to the primitive institution of those several fasts,) when no such "politic considerations" were so much as thought of. But, whatsoever was the true cause, or whether there were more than one, as perhaps there was, certain I am it could not be for derogating any thing from the king's power, and "enlarging that of the archbishop in confirming the election of bishops," as our author tells us. For, though the doctor doth affirm of the metropolitans of the church of England, (page 308, *ut electiones episcoporum suæ provinciæ confirment*,) "that it belongs to them to confirm the elections of the bishops of their several provinces," and for that purpose cites the Canon of the Council of Nice, which our author speaks of; yet afterwards he declares expressly, that no such confirmation is or can be made by the metropolitans without the king's assent preceding: *Cujus assensu electi comprobantur, comprobati confirman- tur, confirmati consecrantur*; (page 313;) which very fully clears the

doctor from being "a better chaplain than he was a subject," as our author makes him.

FULLER.—It was, in my opinion, both indiscreetly and uncharitably done, to jumble them together, being of so different (not to say contrary) originations. Sure I am, though they are pleased to *match them* by force, yet the parties were never *agreed*.

They might as well have added "superintendents, lecturers, assistants, and whole classes;" seeing all such, if vicious in life, or heretical in doctrine, (notwithstanding their reformed names,) are locusts, as well (that is, as *ill*) as any of the other.

But let us return to those my words which first gave the first occasion to these four last Animadversions :—

"And as, about this time, some perchance overvalued the Geneva notes, out of the especial love they bare to the authors and place whence they proceeded; so, on the other side, some without cause did slight, or rather without charity did slander, the same. For in this or the next year, a Doctor, in solemn assembly in the University of Oxford, publicly in his sermon at St. Mary's accused them as guilty of misinterpretation touching the Divinity of Christ, and his Messiahship, as if symbolizing with Arians and Jews against them both. For which he was afterwards suspended by Dr. Robert Abbot, *propter conciones publicas minùs orthodoxas et offensionis plenas*." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 247, 248.)\*

Fain would I know, First, whether these my words import my inclination to defend all in the Geneva notes.

Secondly. Though I neither can nor will (as by the premisses doth appear) excuse all passages in them, I am confident that neither the Animadvertor, nor all "those of all degrees and qualities in both Universities" urging him to write against me, are able to find out any Arianism or Anti-Messianism in those notes. And therefore, as an Historian, I was bound to take notice of the fault and censure of that Doctor, only expressed in the margin by the initial letter of his surname. Our author goeth on :—

211—213. DR. HEYLIN.—"At this time began the troubles in the Low-Countries about matters of religion, heightened between two opposite parties,—Remonstrants, and Contra-Remonstrants; their controversies being chiefly reducible to five points," &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 274.) Not at this time, namely, 1618, which our author speaks of, but some years before. They were now come unto their height, and had divided the whole body of the United Belgic Provinces into two great factions: That of the Remonstrants, (whom in

\* In the margin [occurs] this note: "Dr. H. in Oxford causelessly inveigheth against the Geneva notes."

reproach they call their *Minions*,) being headed by John Olden-Barneveldt, a principal Counsellor of State and of great authority in his country: The other, of the Calvinists or Contra-Remonstrants, being managed by Maurice prince of Orange, the chief commander of the forces of the States United both by sea and land. But the troubles and divisions were now come to their full growth; they “began” many years before, occasioned by a Remonstrance exhibited to the States of Holland by the followers of Dr. James Harmin, who liked better the Melancthonian way than that of Calvin, *anno* 1610; and that Remonstrance counterbalanced by a Contra-Remonstrance made by such divines who were better pleased with Calvin’s doctrine in the deep speculations of Predestination, Grace, Free-will, &c. than with that of Melancthon. Hence grew the names of Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants, occurring frequently in the writings on both sides, till the Remonstrants were condemned in the Synod of Dort, and either forced to yield the cause or quit their country. Each party in the mean time had the opportunity to disperse their doctrines, in which the Remonstrants gained exceedingly upon their adversaries, especially after they had been admitted to a public Conference at the Hague, *anno* 1611; in which they were conceived to have had much the better of the day, and so continued in increase of their power and credit, till the quarrels and animosities between the prince and Barneveldt put a full period to the business by the death of the one, and the authority of the other.

“Hereby the equal reader may judge how candidly Mr. Mountagu, in his ‘Appeal,’ dealeth with our divines, charging them, that the discipline of the church of England is in this Synod held unlawful. And again, The Synod of Dort in some points condemneth, upon the by, even the discipline of the church of England.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 280.) Assuredly Mr. Mountagu deals very candidly with our divines, professing that “he doth reverence them for their places, worth, and learning;” \* though not obliged (as he conceived) to all or any of the conclusions of the Synod at Dort. And he might very well declare, as indeed he doth, that “the discipline of the church of England, in that and other Dutch Synods, was held unlawful,” and by them “condemned upon the by.” For, whereas in the Confession of the Belgic churches, ratified and confirmed in the Synod of Dort, it is declared and maintained, that all ministers are by the word of God of equal power; it must needs follow thereupon, that the superiority of bishops over other ministers is against God’s word: *Quantum verò attinet divini verbi ministros, ubicunque locorum sint, eandem illi potestatem et auctoritatem habent, ut qui omnes sint Christi unici illius episcopi universalis, unicusque capitis ecclesiæ ministri.*† These are the words of that Confession, as it stands ratified and recorded in the Acts of the Synod of Dort, as before was said. In which and by which if the

\* *Appello Cæsarem*, cap. vii. p. 69.

† Confess. Belg. art. 31.

discipline of the church of England be not made unlawful in *terminis terminantibus*, as they use to say; I am sure it is condemned "upon the by," which is as much as Mr. Mountagu had affirmed of it. And howsoever Dr. Carleton, then bishop of Landaff, as well to vindicate his own dignity, as the honour of the church of England, tendered his protestation of that Synod in behalf of episcopacy; yet was it made to signify nothing, nor so much as honoured with an answer; our author noting at the end of this protestation, *Britannorum interpellationi responsum ne gru quidem*; namely, "To this interpellation of the British divines, nothing at all was answered." There might be some wrong done to our divines by the rest of that Synod; but no wrong done by Mr. Mountagu, neither to our divines nor unto that Synod.

"Now whilst, in common discourse, some made this judge, others that serjeant, lord Chancellor, king James made Dr. Williams, lately (and still) dean of Westminster, and soon after bishop of Lincoln." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 290.) In this and the rest which follows touching the advancement of Dr. Williams to the place and dignity of Lord Keeper, there are three things to be observed.

FULLER.—A causeless cavil. I said not absolutely, "They now began," but "Now they began heightened." The Animadvertor knows full well that such participles equivale infinitives.

In Greek.—Εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα, *pro* ἔχειν, Matt. i. 18.

In Latin.—*Sensit medios delapsus in hostes, pro delapsus se cum.* VIRG. *Æneid.* 2. l. 377.

"The troubles in the Low-Countries began heightened," that is, to be heightened. The distemper was bred some years before, which now came to the paroxysm thereof, namely, *anno* 1618.

214. DR. HEYLIN.—And, First, it is to be observed, that though he was then dean of Westminster when the custody of the Great Seal was committed to him; yet was he not then and still dean of that church; that is to say, not dean thereof at such time as our author writ this part of the History: for, speaking of Dr. Hall's return from the Synod of Dort, *anno* 1618, he adds, that "he continued in health till this day, thirty-three years after," (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 278,) which falls into the year 1651. And, certainly, at that time Dr. Williams (then archbishop of York) was not dean of Westminster; that place having been bestowed by his majesty upon Dr. Steward, clerk of the closet, *anno* 1645, being full six years before the time which our author speaks of.

FULLER.—'This I have learned from the Animadvertor, which I knew not before; and I thank him for it. The great distance of Exeter (where I lived) from Oxford, may partly excuse my ignorance therein; who always beheld archbishop Williams as the last dean of Westminster: as indeed he was the last that ever was installed therein. And Dr. Steward never lived minute in, or



gained farthing from, his deanship. So umbratile a dignity is not worth the contending for.

215. DR. HEYLIN.—Secondly. Whereas our author tells us, that the place was “proper not for the plain but guarded gown ;” I would fain know how it should be more proper “for the guarded gown” than it was for the “plain.” There was a time when the Chancellors (as our author telleth us elsewhere) were always bishops ; and from that time till the fall of cardinal Wolsey, that office continued for the most part in the hands of the prelates : at what time, that great office was discharged with such a general contentment, that people found more expedition in their suits, and more ease to their purses, than of later times. By which it seems, that men who “are never bred to know the true grounds and reasons of the Common Law,” might and could mitigate the rigour of it in such difficult cases as were brought before them ; the Chancery not having in those days such a mixture of law as now it hath, nor being so tied up to such intricate rules as now it is.

FULLER.—I have nothing to return in opposition to the Animadvertor, in his endeavouring to make a clergyman proper to be Lord Chancellor of England, “as well qualified as any Common-Lawyer for the place.” Nor if I could, would I disprove what tendeth to the honour of my profession. The little toe is advanced when the head is crowned, as a member of the same body ; and my meanness is sensible of some honour, that any of my calling are put in a capacity of so high a preferment. Only I request, that if the Animadvertor be advanced to the place, and if I have a cause brought before him, that he would be pleased to hear it *cum omni favore*, on this consideration,—that he put me to much trouble in answering his causeless cavils against my Church-History.

Give me leave to add, that I suspect the Common-Lawyers will take advantage from the last words of the Animadvertor, confessing the Court of Chancery now more intricate and mingled with law than in former ages. Hence I fear they will infer, that clergymen (though they were heretofore) will not hereafter be so able and fit to discharge that office. But let us proceed :—

216. DR. HEYLIN.—But, Thirdly, whereas our author in advocating for the Common-Lawyers, prescribeth for them a succession of six descents, he hath therein confuted himself, and saved me the trouble of an Animadversion, by a marginal note ; in which he telleth us, that “sir Christopher Hatton was not bred a lawyer.” If so, then neither was the title so strong, nor the prescription so well-grounded as our author makes it ; the interposition of sir Christopher Hatton between sir Thomas Bromley and sir John Puckering restraining it to three descents, and but thirty years ; which is too short a time for a prescription to be built upon.



FULLER.—I prescribe not for the Common-Lawyers; whose words are, “The Common-Lawyers” (and those, I assure you, knowing enough in this their own art) “prescribed for six descents.” The marginal note was entered by me, a little to check, for (say they) it doth not confute, their prescription; alleging that sir Christopher Hatton, though not bred so professed a lawyer as to be called to the bar, was admitted in one of the Inns of Court, and wore no “plain” but “a guarded gown” in Westminster-Hall, as some still alive do remember. Our author telleth us how Marcus Antonius de Dominis—

217, 218. DR. HEYLIN.—“He had fourteen years been archbishop of Spalato, &c. Conscience in show, and covetousness in deed, caused his coming hither.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 296.) This is a very hard saying, a censure which intrenches too much upon the privileges of Almighty God, who alone knows the secrets of the heart of man. *Interest tenebris, interest cogitationibus nostris, quasi alteris tenebris*, as Minutius hath it.

FULLER.—If my saying intrencheth on Divine privileges, I shall crave pardon from that God who will more freely forgive me, than the Animadvertor would, had I offended him. Besides, it is no encroachment on the prerogative of the Crown of Heaven, to censure the secrets of men’s hearts, when made visible to the world in their actions; and though the thoughts of this prelate were written in secret characters, yet are they easily read, as deciphered by the key of his ensuing deeds, who left the print of his covetous claws in all places where he got English preferment.

DR. HEYLIN.—The man here mentioned had been, in the confession of our author himself, archbishop of Spalato in Dalmatia, a dignity of great power and reputation, and consequently of a fair revenue in proportion to it.

FULLER.—I believe no less; but far short of our English bishoprics. It may be said of Italian dignities, (to which Dalmatian may be reduced, as under the Venetian Commonwealth,) that generally they have high racks, but bad mangers, as being set too thick to burnish about in much breadth and wealth. The *intrado* of the archbishopric of Spalato consisteth partly in his jurisdiction, the exercise whereof is much obstructed; partly in lands, the revenues whereof are more impaired by the vicinity of the Turk, harassing those parts with his daily intrusion. Mercator\* tells us, that the port of Salona (which is hardly an English mile from Spalato) *nunc quidem parùm colitur ob Turcarum viciniam*.

A judicious writer,† valuing his archbishopric, (as it seemeth, to

\* Atlas, p. 334.

† DR. CRAKENTHORP, in *Defensione Eccles. Anglic. pag. 3.*

advantage,) estimateth it annually at three thousand crowns, which falleth a fourth part short of a thousand pounds sterling, a sum exceeded in most of our middling bishoprics: besides, the archbishopric of Spalato was clogged and encumbered with a pension of five hundred crowns, (the sixth part of his revenues,) payable, (with the arrears,) by the pope's command, to one Andrutius. The payment of which sixth part went as much against Spalato's stomach, as the payment of the fifths now-a-days doth from the present possessors to sequestered ministers.

**DR. HEYLIN.**—He could not hope to mend his fortunes by his coming hither, or to advance himself to a more liberal entertainment in the church of England, than what he had attained unto in the church of Rome. Covetousness, therefore, could not be the motive for leaving his own estate, of which he had been possessed fourteen years in our author's reckoning, to betake himself to a strange country, where he could promise himself nothing but protection and the freedom of conscience. Our author might have said, with more probability, that covetousness, and not conscience, was the cause of his going hence; no bait of profit or preferment being laid before him to invite him hither, as they were both, by those which had the managing of that design, to allure him hence. He had given great trouble to the pope by his defection from that church, and no small countenance to the doctrine of the protestant churches by his coming over unto ours. The foundering of so great a pillar seemed to prognosticate, that the fabric of that church was not like to stand. And yet he gave greater blows to them by his pen, than by the defection of his person; his learned books entituled *De Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ*, being still unanswered. In which respect, those of that church bestirred themselves to disgrace his person, devising many other causes by which he might be moved or forced to forsake those parts in which he durst no longer tarry. But finding little credit given to their libellous pamphlets, they began to work upon him by more secret practices: insinuating, that he had neither that respect nor those advancements which might encourage him to stay; that the new pope, Gregory XV., was his special friend; that he might choose his own preferments, and make his own conditions, if he would return. And on the other side, they cunningly wrought him out of credit with king James by the arts of Gondomar; and lessened his esteem amongst the clergy by some other artifices: so that the poor man, being in a manner lost on both sides, was forced to a necessity of swallowing that accursed bait by which he was hooked over to his own destruction. For which and for the rest of the story, the reader may repair for satisfaction to this present History.

“Besides, the king would never bestow an episcopal charge in England on a foreigner; no, not on his own countrymen the Scots.” (Ch.

Hist. vol. iii. p. 300.) This must be understood with reference to the church of England, king James bestowing many bishoprics upon his countrymen the Scots, in the realm of Ireland. And if he did not the like here, (as indeed he did not,) it neither was for want of affection to them, nor of confidence in them; but because he would not put any such discouragement upon the English, who looked on those preferments as the greatest and most honourable rewards of arts and industry. *Quis enim virtutem exquireret ipsam, præmia si tollas?*

FULLER.—Dark men are the best comment upon themselves, whose *precedent* are best expounded by their *subsequent* actions. Whoso considereth the rapacity and tenacity of this prelate in England, will easily believe that a two-handed covetousness moved him to leave his native country and come over hither:—One to save, the other to gain: *To save*; that is, to evade the payment of the aforesaid pension, with the arrears thereof: *To gain*; promising himself, as by the future will appear, not only protection, but preferment; not only safety, but more plenty, by coming hither. He had learning enough to deserve, ambition enough to desire, boldness enough to beg, and presumed king James had bounty enough to give, him the highest and best preferment in England; and he who publicly did beg York, may be presumed privately to have promised the archbishopric of Canterbury to himself.

219. DR. HEYLIN.—“All men’s mouths were now filled with discourse of prince Charles’s match with Donna Maria, the infanta of Spain. The protestants grieved thereat, fearing that this marriage would be the funerals of their religion,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 306.) The business of the match with Spain hath already sufficiently been agitated, between the author of “the History of the Reign of King Charles” and his *Observer*: and yet I must add something to let our author and his reader to understand thus much, that the protestants had no cause to fear such a funeral.

FULLER.—Had I said, that “the protestants justly feared this marriage,” then the Animadvertor had justly censured; whereas now, grant they feared where no fear was, he findeth fault where no fault is. Historians may and must relate those great and general impressions which are made on the spirits of people, and are not bound to justify the causes thereof to be sound and sufficient. Ten thousand persons of quality are still alive, who can and will attest, that a panic fear for that match invaded the nation.

DR. HEYLIN.—They knew they lived under such a king who loved his sovereignty too well to quit any part thereof to the pope of Rome; especially to part with that supremacy in ecclesiastical matters which he esteemed the fairest flower in the royal garland. They knew they lived under such a king, whose interest it was to preserve religion in

the same state in which he found it; and could not fear but that he would sufficiently provide for the safety of it.

FULLER.—Mr. Camden, writing of the match of queen Elizabeth with Monsieur, younger brother to the king of France, hath this presage,—that when Mr. Stubs, whose hand was cut off, said, “God save the queen!” the multitude standing by held their peace, rendering this as one reason thereof: *Ex odio nuptiarum, quas religione exitiosas futuras præsagierunt*. “Out of hatred to that match, which they presaged would be destructive to religion.”\*

Now, may not the Animadvertor as well tax Mr. Camden for inserting this needless note, and tell the world, that no princess was more skilled in queen-craft than queen Elizabeth, and that this presage of her people was falsely founded? I detract not from the policy or piety, head or heart of king James; but this I say, Let sovereigns be never so good, their subjects under them will have their own joys, griefs, loves, hatreds, hopes, fears; sometimes *caused*, sometimes *causeless*; and historians have an equal commission to report both to posterity.

DR. HEYLIN.—If any protestants feared the funeral of their religion, they were such protestants as had been “frighted out of their wits,” as you know who used to call the Puritans; or such who, under the name of protestants, had contrived themselves into a faction not only against episcopacy, but even monarchy also.

FULLER.—I profess I know not who used to call Puritans “Protestants frighted out of their wits:” whoever it was, it was not Michael the archangel, who would not rail on the devil.

By PROTESTANTS, I mean “Protestants indeed;” or, if you will rather have it, “Christians sound in their judgment, uncontrived into any faction;” so far from being anti-episcopal, that some of them were members of the hierarchy; and so far from destroying monarchy, that, since, they endeavoured the preservation thereof with the destruction of their own estates.

As worthy Dr. Hackwell, archdeacon of Surrey, was outed his chaplain’s place, for his opposing the match when first tendered to prince Henry; so many (qualified as aforesaid) concurred with his judgment, in the resumption of the match with king Charles; notwithstanding they were justly and fully possessed of the integrity and ability of king James. Their seriously considering the zeal of the Spanish to promote popery; the activity of the Romish priests to gain proselytes; their dexterous sinisterity in seducing souls; the negligence of too many English ministers in feeding their flocks; the plausibility of popery to vulgar judgments; the lusciousness thereof to the palate of flesh and blood; the fickleness of our

\* CAMDEN’S “Elizabeth,” anno 1581, pag. 316.

And though the Spaniards at the first spoke big, and stood upon such points as the king neither could nor would in honour or conscience consent unto; yet things were after brought to such a temperament, that the marriage was agreed upon, the articles by both kings subscribed, a proxy made by the prince of Wales to espouse the Infanta, and all things on her part prepared for the day of the wedding. The breach which followed came not from any averseness in the Court of Spain; though where the fault was, and by what means occasioned, need not here be said.

FULLER.—I expected when the Animadvertor had knocked away my bowl, he would have laid a toucher in the room thereof: but if neither of us have a bowl in the alley, we must both begin the game again.

May the reader be pleased to know, that, living in Exeter, I had many hours' private converse with the right honourable John Digby, earl of Bristol, who favoured me so far, (much above my desert,) that, at his last going over into France, (where he died,) he was earnest with me to go with him, promising me, to use his own expression, "that I should have half a loaf with him, so long as he had a whole one to himself." This I mention to insinuate a probability, that I may be as knowing in the mysteries of the Spanish match as the Animadvertor.

Double was the cause of the breach of the Spanish match: One, such as may with no less truth than safety be related, as publicly insisted on in the Parliament, namely, the Spanish prevarication to restore the Palatinate: The other secret, not so necessary to be known, nor safe to be reported. And I crave the liberty to conceal it, seeing the Animadvertor himself hath his politic aposiopesis, breaking off as abruptly as the Spanish match with this wary reservation;—"though where the fault was, and by what means occasioned, need not here to be said."

221. DR. HEYLIN.—But well fare our author, for all that; who finally hath absolved the Spaniard from this breach, and laid the same upon king James, "despairing of any restitution to be made of the Palatinate" by the way of treaty.

"Whereupon, king James not only broke off all treaty with Spain, but also called the great Council of his kingdom together." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 323.) By which it seems, that the breaking-off of the treaty did precede the Parliament. But, *Multa apparent quæ non sunt*, "Every thing is not as it seems." The Parliament in this case came before, by whose continual importunity and solicitation the breach of the treaties followed after. The king loved peace too well to lay aside the treaties, and engage in war before he was desperate of success any other way than by that of the sword, and was assured both

of the hands and hearts of his subjects to assist him in it. And therefore our author should have said, that "the king not only called together his great Council, but broke off the treaty;" and not have given us here such an *hysteron proteron* as neither doth consist with reason nor the truth of story.

FULLER.—To be ἄσπονδος, "a covenant-breaker," is a foul fault, as the apostle accounteth it, Rom. i. 31. Far be it from me to charge it causelessly on any, especially on a dead Christian, especially on a king, especially on king James, generally represented over-fond of peace, and therefore the more improbable first to infringe it.

To prevent exception, in the next edition, "calling the Parliament" shall have the precedence of "breaking off the treaty" for the match.

I suspect that the Animadvertor hath committed a greater transposition, when affirming king James to have designed the Spanish match in order to the recovery of the Palatinate.\* Whereas it plainly appears,† that, before any suspicion of troubles in the Palatinate, (occasioned by prince Frederick's accepting the crown of Bohemia,) this match was projected by king James for prince Henry, his eldest son; and, after his death, resumed for prince Charles, without the least relation to the regaining of the (not then lost) palatinate.

I have passed over some additory notes of the Animadvertor in this king's reign, partly because I perceive my book swells beyond the expected proportion, partly that I may have the more scope to answer every particular objected against me in the reign of king Charles, in such things which lie level to our own eyes, and are within our own remembrance.

\* In his "Short View of the Reign of King Charles." in the "Historical Observations" of Mr. Rushworth.

† In the "Cabala," and

## PART III.

CONTAINING

FULLER'S ANSWER TO HEYLIN'S ANIMADVERSIONS ON  
BOOK XI. OF THE CHURCH-HISTORY OF BRITAIN.

### BOOK XI.

*Containing the Reign of King Charles.*

#### PART I.

222. DR. HEYLIN.—This book concludes our author's History, and my Animadversions. And if the end be suitable unto the beginning, it is like to find me work enough; our author stumbling at the threshold, which, amongst superstitious people, hath been counted for an ill presage.

FULLER.—Who, I pray, stumbled in the beginning of his Animadversions? when he said, That the Britons worshipped but one God, and that Diana was none of their original deity? What, if I stumbled, yea, and should fall too? Hath not the Animadvertor read?—"Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy! when I fall, I shall rise again," Micah vii. 8.

DR. HEYLIN.—Having placed king Charles upon the throne, he goes on to tell us: "On the fourteenth day of May following, king James's funerals were performed very solemnly, in the collegiate church at Westminster." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 333.) "Not on the fourteenth, but the fourth," saith the author of the "History of the Reign of King Charles;" and both *true* alike. It neither was on *the fourth*, nor on *the fourteenth*, but *the seventh*, of May, on which those solemn obsequies were performed at Westminster. Of which, if he will not take my word, let him consult the pamphlet, called, "The Observator observed," (fol. 6,) and he shall be satisfied. Our author's clock must keep time better, or else we shall never know how the day goes with him.

FULLER.—I will take his word, without going any further; and this erroneous date, in my next edition, shall, God willing, be mended accordingly. That clock which always strikes true may well be forfeited to the lord of the manor; though mine, I hope,



will be found to go false as seldom as another's. Our author saith,—

223. DR. HEYLIN.—“As for Dr. Preston, &c. his party would persuade us, that he might have chosen his own mitre.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 336.) And some of his party would persuade us, “that he had not only large parts, of sufficient receipt to manage the Broad Seal itself,” but that “the Seal was proffered to him.” (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 355.) But we are not bound to believe all which is said by that party, who looked upon the man with such reverence as came near idolatry.

FULLER.—I do not say, “they do persuade,” but “they *would* persuade us.” And here the common expression takes place with me: *Non persuadebunt, etiamsi persuaserint*. Grant, I do not believe all which is said by his party, yet I believe it was my duty, as an historian, to take notice of so remarkable a passage, and to report it to posterity, charging my margin (as I have done) with the name and place of the author,\* wherein I found it related.

DR. HEYLIN.—His principles and engagements were too well known by those which governed affairs, to venture him unto any such great trust in church or state; and his activity so suspected, that he would not have been long suffered to continue preacher at Lincoln's Inn. As for his intimacy with the duke, (too violent to be long-lasting,) it proceeded not from any good opinion which the duke had of him, but that he found how instrumental he might be to manage that prevailing party to the king's advantage. But when it was found, that “he had more of the serpent in him, than of the dove;” and that he was not tractable in steering the helm of his own party by the court-compass, he was discountenanced and laid by, as not worth the keeping. He seemed the court-meteor for a while, raised to a sudden height of expectation; and, having flashed and blazed a little, went out again, and was as suddenly forgotten.

FULLER.—This is only additional, and no whit opposite, to what I have written; and therefore I am not obliged to return any answer thereunto. Our author proceeds:—

224—226. DR. HEYLIN.—“Next day the king, coming from Canterbury, met her at Dover; whence with all solemnity she was conducted to Somerset-house in London, where a chapel was new-prepared for her devotion, with a convent adjoining of Capuchin Friars, according to the articles of her marriage.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 337.) In all this nothing true, but that the new queen was conducted with all solemnity from Dover to London. For, First, although there was a chapel prepared, yet was it not prepared for her, nor “at Somerset-

\* Mr. Ball in Dr. Preston's Life.

house." The chapel which was then prepared was not prepared for her, but for the lady Infanta, built in the king's house of St. James, at such time as the treaty with Spain stood upon good terms, and then intended for the devotions of the princess of Wales, not the queen of England. Secondly. The articles of the marriage make no mention of the Capuchin Friars, nor any convent to be built for them. The priests who came over with the queen were by agreement to be all of the Oratorian Order, as less suspected by the English, whom they had never provoked, as had the Jesuits, and most other of the Monastic Orders, by their mischievous practices. But these Oratorians being sent back with the rest of the French, *anno* 1626, and not willing to expose themselves to the hazard of a second expulsion, the Capuchins, under Father Joseph, made good the place. The breach with France, the action at the Isle of Rheé, and the loss of Rochelle, did all occur, before the Capuchins were thought of, or admitted hither. And, Thirdly, some years after the making of the peace between the Crowns, (which was in the latter end of 1628, and not before,) the queen obtained, that these Friars might have leave to come over to her, some lodgings being fitted for them in Somerset-house, and a new chapel then and there built for her devotions.

FULLER.—Here, and in the next note, the Animadvertor *habet confitentem reum*. And, not to take covert of a Latin expression, in plain English, "I confess my mistake;" which is no original—but a derivative—error in me, who can (if so pleased) allege the printed author who hath misguided me. Yet I will patiently bear my proportion of guilt, and will provide, God willing, for the amendment in the next edition. Thus, being so supple to confess my fault, when convinced thereof, I therefore may and will be the more stiff in standing on the terms of mine own integrity, when causelessly accused.

But if the Animadvertor be too insulting over me, let him remember his own "Short View of the Life of King Charles," where he tells us of the three Welsh generals, that they submitted to mercy, which they never tasted, naming Laughern, Powel, and Poyer.\* Whereas two of them did find mercy, a little male child being taken up, who did cast lots at White-hall; and, by providence ordering casualty, Laughern and Powel were pardoned, and lately, if not still, alive. But I forgive the Doctor for this error, being better than a truth,—two gentlemen gaining their lives thereby. Our author proceeds:—

227, 228. DR. HEYLIN.—"The bishop of Lincoln, Lord-Keeper, was now daily descendent in the king's favour; who so highly distasted him, that he would not have him, as dean of Westminster, to

\* Compare his page 140, with his page 144.

perform any part of his coronation." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 340.) As little truth in this as in that before. For, First, the bishop of Lincoln was not Lord-Keeper at the time of the coronation. Secondly. If he had been so, and that the king was so distasted with him as not to suffer him to assist at his coronation, how came he to be suffered to be present at it in the capacity of Lord-Keeper? For that he did so, is affirmed by our author, saying, "that the king took a scroll of parchment out of his bosom, and gave it to the Lord-Keeper Williams, who read it to the Commons four several times,—east, west, north, and south." (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 343.) Thirdly. The Lord-Keeper, who read that scroll, was not the Lord-Keeper Williams, but the Lord-Keeper Coventry; the Seal being taken from the bishop of Lincoln, and committed to the custody of sir Thomas Coventry, in October before. And therefore, Fourthly, our author is much out, in placing both the coronation, and the following Parliament, before the change of the Lord-Keeper; and sending sir John Suckling to fetch that Seal, at the end of a Parliament in the spring, which he had brought away with him before Michaelmas term. But as our author was willing to keep the bishop of Lincoln in the deanery of Westminster, for no less than five or six years after it was conferred on another; so is he as desirous to continue him Lord-Keeper for as many months after the Seal had been entrusted to another hand.

FULLER.—This also is an error. I neither can nor will defend the Lord-Keeper Williams, put for the Lord-Keeper Coventry, which hath betrayed me to some consequential incongruities. I will not plead for myself in such a suit, where I foresee the verdict will go against me. Only I move, as to mitigation of costs and damages, that greater slips have fallen from the pens of good historians.

Mr. Speed in his "Chronicle," (first edition, page 786,) speaking of Henry, eldest son to king Henry VIII., maketh archbishop Cranmer (mistaken for Warham) his godfather, twenty-four years before Cranmer ever sate in that See. I write not this to accuse him, but in part to excuse myself, by paralleling mine with as evident a mistake. I hope, my free confession of my fault, with promise of emendation of it and the appendants thereof, in my next edition, will meet with the reader's absolution. And let the Animadvertor for the present (if so pleased) make merry, and feast himself on my mistake, assuring him, that he is likely to fast a long time hereafter. Our author proceeds:—

229. DR. HEYLIN.—"The earl of Arundel, as Earl-Marshal of England, and the duke of Buckingham, as Lord High Constable of England, for that day, went before his majesty in that great solemnity." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 342.) In this passage, and the next that follows,

our author shows himself as bad an herald in marshalling a royal show, as in stating the true time of the creation of a noble peer. Here in this place he placeth the Earl-Marshal before the Constable ; whereas by the statute 31 Henry VIII. c. 10, the Constable is to have precedency before the Marshal. Nor want there precedents to show, that the Lord High Constable did many times direct his mandates to the Earl-Marshal, as one of the ministers of his court, "willing and requiring" him to perform such and such services, as in the said precepts were expressed.

FULLER.—My heraldry is right both in place and time. The earl of Arundel, as Earl-Marshal, went after the duke of Buckingham, as Lord High Constable, though going before him. For barons went (in this royal procession, at the king's coronation) before bishops, bishops before viscounts, viscounts before earls, the meaner before the greater officers of state. Thus the Lord Constable (though the last) was the first, because, of all subjects, nearest to the person of the sovereign. It seemeth, the days were very long when the Animadvertor wrote these causeless cavils ; which being now grown very short, I cannot afford so much time in confuting them.

This his cavilling mindeth me of what he hath mistaken in his Geography. For, the younger son of an English earl coming to Geneva, desired a carp for his dinner, having read in the Doctor's "Geography," that the Leman lake had plenty of the fish, and the best and biggest of that kind. The people wondered at his desire of such a dainty, which that place did not afford ; but told him, that they had trouts as good and great as any in Europe. Indeed, learned Gesner\* doth observe, that the trouts caught in this lake, sent to, and sold at Lyons, are mistaken for salmons by strangers, unacquainted with their proportions. It seems the Animadvertor's pen is so much given to cavilling, that he turned trouts into carps, though none of them so great as this his *carp* at me, for making the Lord Marshal to go before the Lord Constable, at the king's coronation. Our author proceeds :—

230. DR. HEYLIN.—In the next place we are informed, "That the king's train, being six yards long of purple velvet, was held up by the lord Compton, and the lord viscount Dorchester." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 342.) That the lord Compton was one of them which held up the king's train, I shall easily grant ; he being then Master of the Robes, and thereby challenging a right to perform this service. But that the lord viscount Dorchester was the other of them, I shall never grant ; there being no such viscount at the time of the coronation. I cannot say, but that sir Dudley Carleton might be one of those which held up

\* *De Piscibus, in voce "Trutta."*

the train, though I am not sure of it. But sure I am, that sir Dudley Carleton was not made baron of Imber-court till towards the latter end of the following Parliament of *anno* 1626, nor created viscount Dorchester until some years after.

FULLER.—It is a mere mistake of the printer, for viscount Doncaster, son of (and now himself) the earl of Carlisle; whose father having a great office in the wardrobe, this place was proper for him to perform. All will presume me knowing enough in the orthography of his title, who was my patron when I wrote the book; and whom I shall ever, whilst I live, deservedly honour, for his great bounty unto me. Our author proceeds:—

231. DR. HEYLIN.—“The lord archbishop did present his majesty to the Lords and Commons, east, west, north, south; asking their minds four several times, if they did consent to the coronation of king Charles their lawful sovereign.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 342.) This is a piece of new State-doctrine, never known before,—that the coronation of the king (and consequently his succession to the Crown of England) should depend on the consent of the Lords and Commons, who were then assembled; the coronation not proceeding, as he after telleth us, till their “consent was given four times by acclamations.”

FULLER.—I exactly follow the language of my worthy intelligencer, a Doctor of Divinity, still alive, rich in learning and piety, present on the place, and an exact observer of all passages; and see no reason to depart from it. I am so far from making the coronation of the sovereign depend on the consent of his subjects, that I make not the kingly power depend on his coronation, who, before it, and without it, is lawful and effectual king to all purposes and intents. This was not a consent like that of the bride to the bridegroom, the want whereof doth null the marriage; but a mere ceremonial one, *in majorem pompam*; which did not make but manifest—not constitute but declare—his power over his people. So that the king got not one single mite of title more, than he had before this four-fold acclamation.

DR. HEYLIN.—And this I call “a piece of new State-doctrine, never known before,” because I find the contrary in the coronation of our former kings. For, in the form and manner of the coronation of king Edward VI. described in the “Catalogue of Honour,” set forth by Thomas Mills of Canterbury, *anno* 1610, we find it thus: “The king, being carried by certain noble courtiers in another chair, unto the four sides of the stage, was by the archbishop of Canterbury declared unto the people, (standing round about,) both by God’s and man’s laws, to be the right and lawful king of England, France, and Ireland, and proclaimed that day to be crowned, consecrated, and anointed: unto whom he demanded, whether they would obey and

serve, or not? By whom it was again with a loud cry answered, *God save the king!* and, *Ever live his majesty!*" The same we have in substance, but in fewer words, in the coronation of king James, where it is said, that "the king was showed to the people, and that they were required to make acknowledgment of their allegiance to his majesty by the archbishop; which they did by acclamations." Assuredly, the difference is exceeding vast betwixt *obeying* and *consenting*; betwixt the people's "acknowledging their allegiance and promising to obey and serve their lawful sovereign," and *giving their consent* to his coronation, as if it could not be performed without such consent.

FULLER.—The hinge of the controversy turneth on the critical difference betwixt these two phrases:—"Acknowledging their allegiance to their sovereign:" "Giving consent to his coronation."

The Animadvertor endeavours to widen the distance betwixt them, and make the difference vast, yea, exceeding vast, against the will of the words, which are well-inclined to an agreement, there being a vicinity, yea, affinity betwixt them; since such who will not acknowledge their allegiance will not give consent to his coronation, and such who will consent thereunto will acknowledge their allegiance.

I refer myself wholly in this difference to the arbitration of Mr. Mills, (the same author and edition cited by the Animadvertor,) who, speaking of the ancient form of the coronation of the kings of England, in reference to this passage, thus expresseth himself:—

"After the king hath a little reposed himself in the chair or throne, erected upon the scaffold, then the archbishop of Canterbury shall go unto the four squares of the scaffold, and, with a loud voice, ask the good-liking of the people, concerning the coronation of the king."\*

Small, I am sure, is the difference betwixt *consenting* and *good-liking*. However, the king's coronation, though following after, did not depend on, such *consent*, *good-liking*, or *acknowledging of allegiance*; seeing, amongst our English kings, an usurper's title was not the better with—nor a lawful prince's the worse without—such ceremonies of State:—

DR. HEYLIN.—Nor had the late archbishop been reproached so generally by the common people, (and that reproach published in several pamphlets,) for altering the king's oath at his coronation, to the infringing of the liberties, and diminution of the rights, of the English subjects; had he done them such a notable piece of service, as freeing them from all promises to obey and serve, and making the king's coronation to depend on their consent. For bishop Laud—

\* MILLS's "Catalogue of Honour," pag. 51.

being one of that Committee, which was appointed by the king to review the form and order of the coronation, to the end it might be fitted to some rites and ceremonies of the church of England which had not been observed before—must bear the greatest blame in this alteration, (if any such alteration had been made as our author speaks of,) because he was the principal man whom the king relied on in that business.

FULLER.—This proceedeth on the former foundation ; which being false and confuted, the superstructure sinketh therewith.

DR. HEYLIN.—But our author tells us in his Preface, that this last book, with divers of the rest, were written by him, when “the Monarchy was turned into a State.” And I dare believe him. He had not else so punctually conformed his language to the new State-doctrine, by which the making (and, consequently, the unmaking) of kings is wholly vested in the people, according to that maxim of Buchanan : *Populo jus est, imperium cui velit deferat* ; than which, there is not a more pestilent and seditious passage in his whole book, *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, though there be nothing else but treason and sedition in it.

FULLER.—What I wrote in this point, I wrote in my Preface, that it might be obvious to every eye ; namely, that “the first three books of my Church-History were, for the main, written in the reign of the late king ; the other nine, since Monarchy was turned into a State.”

My language in the latter books forbearcth such personal passages on the king and his posterity, which, in his life-time, were as consistent with my loyalty, as, since, inconsistent with my safety. I will instance in one of them :—

“Some of whose offspring [king John’s] shall flourish, in free and full power on the English throne, when the Chair of Pestilence shall be burnt to ashes ; and neither triple-crown left at Rome to be worn, nor any head there which shall dare to wear it.” (Ch. Hist. book iii. vol. i. p. 341.)

But if the Animadvertor, or any by him employed, can in any my nine last books discover a syllable sounding to the disparagement of the king’s person or power, to any impartial ear, let me, who so long fed on the king’s large diet, be justly famished for my unthankfulness.

As for Buchanan, as I admire his poetry, so I dislike his divinity, especially in this point ; desiring that his principles may never come south the river Tweed, and, if offering it, may be drowned in their passage. Our author proceeds :—

232. DR. HEYLIN.—“Then as many earls and barons as could con-



veniently stand about the throne, did lay their hands on the crown on his majesty's head, protesting to spend their bloods to maintain it to him and his lawful heirs." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 343.) A promise faithfully performed by many of them, some losing their lives for him in the open field, others exhausting their estates in defence of his, many more venturing their whole fortunes by adhering to him to a confiscation. A catalogue of which last we may find subscribed to a letter, sent from the Lords and Commons of Parliament assembled in Oxford, to those at Westminster, *anno* 1643. And by that catalogue we may also see what and who they were who so ignobly brake faith with him; all those whose names we find not in that subscription, or presently superadded to it, being to be reckoned amongst those who, instead of "spending their blood to maintain the crown to him, and to his lawful successors," concurred with them, either *in opere* or *in voto*, who despoiled him of it. And, to say truth, they were rewarded as they had deserved; the first thing which was done by the House of Commons (after the king, by their means, had been brought to the fatal block) being to turn them out of power, to dissolve their House, and annul their privileges, reducing them to the same condition with the rest of the subjects.

FULLER.—I behold all this paragraph as a letter sent to me, which requires no answer, (only I bear the Animadvertor witness, that it is delivered,) seeing I was none of the Lords on either side. But I am not altogether satisfied in the adequation of the Animadvertor's dichotomy to all the English nobility,—that all not subscribing the Catalogue at Oxford must instantly be concluded on the opposite party; believing that, upon serious search, some Lords would be found in their minority, and not necessarily reducible to either of these heads.

233. DR. HEYLIN.—"And it had not been amiss, if such who would be accounted his friends and admirers had followed him in the footsteps of his moderation; content with the enjoying, without the enjoining, their private practices and opinions on others." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 349.) This comes in as an inference only on a former passage, in which it is said of bishop Andrews, that "in what place soever he came, he never pressed any other ceremonies upon them, than such as he found to be used there before his coming;" though otherwise condemned by some for many superstitious ceremonies and superfluous ornaments used in his private chapel. How true this is, I am not able to affirm.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor (if so disposed) might soon have satisfied himself in this point, being beneficed in Hampshire, the last diocess of bishop Andrews. And though his institution into his living was since the death of that worthy prelate, yet his information in this particular had been easy from the aged clergy of his

vicinage. Sure I am, he ever was inquisitive enough in matters which might make for his advantage ; so that his *not denying* tantamounteth to *the affirming* of the matter in question.

DR. HEYLIN.—I am less able (if it should be true) to commend it in him. It is not certainly the office of a careful bishop, only to leave things as he found them ; but to reduce them, if amiss, to those rules and canons from which, by the forwardness of some to innovate, and the connivance of others at the innovations, they had been suffered to decline.

FULLER.—I comply cordially with the Animadvertor in all this last sentence. Only I add, that it is also the office of a good bishop, not to endeavour the alteration of things well-settled before. This was the constant practice of Dr. Andrews, successively bishop of Chichester, Ely, and Winchester, who never urged any other ceremonies than what he found there. Now, whereas the Animadvertor saith, that “if this should be true, he is not able to commend it in him ;” the matter is not much, seeing the actions of bishop Andrews are able to commend themselves.

234. DR. HEYLIN.—And, for the inference itself, it is intended chiefly for the late archbishop of Canterbury, against whom he had a fling before in the fourth book of this History, not noted there, because reserved to another place, of which more hereafter. Condemned here for “his want of moderation, in enjoining his private practices and opinions on other men.” But, First, our author had done well to have spared the man, who hath already reckoned for all his errors both with God and the world.

FULLER.—He hath so ; and I hope, what he could not satisfy in himself was done by his Saviour. But, First, the Animadvertor had done well to have spared his censure on my intentions, except he had better assurance of them. Here I must, reader, appeal to an higher than thyself, to Him who can read the secrets of my heart, before whom I protest, that in this passage I did not reflect in any degree on the archbishop of Canterbury. To make this the more probable, know, the Articles of his Visitation were observed to be as moderate as any bishop’s in England.

Here let me enter this memorable ; and let the Animadvertor confute it, if he can : There was a design of the thirty-six dissenters (of whom hereafter) in the Convocation to obtain, that these Articles of his Visitation might be precedential to all the bishops in England, as being in themselves inoffensive, and containing no innovations. This was by some communicated to archbishop Laud, who at first seemed to approve thereof ; and how it came afterwards to miscarry, I am not bound to discover.

I confess, this my expression did eye another person, related to bishop Andrews, whom I forbear to name, except by the Animadvertor's reply unto me I be forced thereunto.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, Secondly, it had been better if he had told us what those “private practices and opinions” were, which the archbishop, with such want of moderation, did enjoin on others.

FULLER.—They are reckoned up in my Church-History: Book xi. vol. iii. pp. 415, 416. This is direction enough; and there one may find more than a good many of such opinions and practices; on the self-same token, that it was discreetly done of the Animadvertor to pass them over in silence, without a word in their defence or excuse. I will not again here repeat them, partly, because I will not revive what in some sort is dead and buried; and, partly, because I charitably believe, that some engaged therein, and still alive, are since sorry for their over-activity therein.

DR. HEYLIN.—For it is possible enough, that the opinions which he speaks of might be the public doctrines of the church of England, maintained by him, in opposition to those private opinions which the Calvinian party had intended to obtrude upon her: a thing complained of by Spalato; who well observed, that many of the opinions both of Luther and Calvin were received amongst us, as part of the doctrine and confession of the church of England; which otherwise he acknowledged to be capable of an orthodox sense. *Præter Anglicanam Confessionem (quam mihi ut modestam prædicabant) multa video Lutheri et Calvinii dogmata obtinuisse*, \* as he there objects.

FULLER.—I am not bound to stand to the judgment of Spalato, who would not stand to his own judgment; but, first in heart, then in body, went back into Egypt. Lay not such unsavoury salt in my dish, but cast it to the dunghill.

DR. HEYLIN.—He that reads the “Gag,” and the “*Appello Cæsarem*” of bishop Mountagu cannot but see, that those opinions which our author condemned for private, were the true doctrine of this church, professed and held forth in the Book of Articles, the Homilies, and the Common-Prayer Book.

FULLER.—He that reads the answers returned by several divines to the books of bishop Mountagu, cannot but see, that they were rather private opinions, than the true and professed doctrine of the church of England.

Here, reader, I cannot but remember a passage betwixt two messengers, sent to carry defiances from several armies; who, meeting in the mid-way, (though naked and without swords, yet,) to manifest their zeal to their cause, fought it out with their trum-

\* *Consilium redeundi.*

pets, till, both being well-wearied, they went about their business, leaving the main success to be tried by their armies.

Historians are beheld in the notion of heralds. And, seeing the Animadvertor and I have now clashed it with our trumpets, let us leave the rest to be disputed and decided by those learned and pious persons, who publicly in print have engaged therein, and who have [met] or may in due time meet together in bliss and happiness. "In my father's house are" (though no wall of partition) "many mansions;" (John xiv. 2;) several receptacles (as some suppose) for Martyrs, Confessors, &c. and why not for such as, dissenting in the superstructures, concur in holy life, and the fundamentals of religion?

DR. HEYLIN.—And it is possible enough, that the practices which he speaks of were not private neither, but a reviver of those ancient and public usages which the Canons of the church enjoined, and by the remissness of the late government had been discontinued. But, for a justification of the practices, (the private practices he speaks of,) I shall direct him to an author of more credit with him. Which author, First, tells us of the bishops generally, "that, being of late years either careless or indulgent, they had not required, within their diocesses, that strict obedience to ecclesiastical constitutions which the law expected; upon which, the liturgy began totally to be laid aside, and inconformity the uniform practice of the church."\* He tells us, Secondly, of archbishop Abbot in particular, that "his extraordinary remissness, in not exacting a strict conformity to the prescribed orders of the church in point of ceremony, seemed to dissolve those legal determinations to their first principle of indifferency, and let in such an habit of inconformity, as the future reduction of those tender-conscienced men's too-long-discontinued obedience was interpreted an innovation."† And, Finally, he tells of archbishop Laud, who succeeded Abbot in that See, that, "being of another mind and mettle, he did not like that the external worship of God should follow the fashion of every private fancy; and what he did not like in that subject, as he was in state, so he thought it was his duty to reform. To which end, in his metropolitical visitation, he calls upon all, both clergy and laity, to observe the rules of the church."‡ And this is that which our author calls, the "enjoining of his private practices;" *private*, perhaps, in the private opinion of some men, who had declared themselves to be professed enemies to all public order.

FULLER.—I have cause to give credit unto him, § who, to the lustre of his ancient and noble extraction, hath added the light of learning, not as his profession, but accomplishment; whereby he hath presented the public with an handsome History, likely to

\* "History of King Charles," fol. 143.

† *Idem*, p. 131.

‡ *Idem*, p. 143.

§ H. Le Strange, esq.

prove as acceptable to posterity, as it hath done to the present age. The gentleman, in that his passage, reflecteth only on such ceremonies as stood in force by canon, but had been disused; with whom I concur. But the controversy in hand is about additional ceremonies, enjoined by no canons, (save some men's over-imperious commanding, and others' over-officious complying,) justly deserving the censure of "private practices." Our author proceeds:—

235. DR. HEYLIN.—“A Commission was granted unto five bishops, (whereof bishop Laud of the quorum,) to suspend archbishop Abbot from exercising his authority any longer, because uncanonical for casual homicide.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 349.) Had our author said, that bishop Laud had been one of the number, he had hit it right; the Commission being granted to five bishops; namely, Dr. Mountaigne, bishop of London; Dr. Neile, bishop of Durham; Dr. Buckridge, bishop of Rochester; Dr. Howson, bishop of Oxford; and Dr. Laud, bishop of Bath and Wells; or to any four, three, or two of them, and no more than so. Had bishop Laud been of the quorum, his presence and consent had been so necessary to all their consultations, conclusions, and dispatch of businesses, that nothing could be done without him; whereas, by the words of the Commission, any two of them were empowered, and, consequently, all of them must be of the quorum, as well as he; which every Justice's Clerk cannot choose but laugh at.

FULLER.—They will soon cease their laughter at the sad story I am about to relate. But be it premised, that here I use the *quorum* not in the legal strictness thereof, but in that passable sense in common discourse; namely, for one so active in a business, that nothing is (though it may be) done without him therein.

When the writing for archbishop Abbot's suspension was to be subscribed by the bishops aforesaid, the four seniors (namely, London, Durham, Rochester, and Oxford) all declined to set their hands thereunto, and (seemingly at the least) showed much reluctance and regret thereat. “Then give me the pen,” said bishop Laud, and though *last* in place, *first* subscribed his name. Encouraged by whose words and example, the rest, after some demur, did the like.

This was attested to me by him who had best cause to know it,—the aged and credible Register, still alive, who attended in the place upon them. This I formerly knew, but concealed it; and had not published it now, if not necessitated thereunto in my just defence.

236. DR. HEYLIN.—Nor is there any such thing as a casual homicide mentioned, or so much as glanced at, in that Commission; the Commission only saying, “That the said archbishop could not at that present in his own person attend those services which were otherwise

proper for his cognizance and jurisdiction ; and which, as archbishop of Canterbury, he might and ought in his own person to have performed and executed." I am loath to rub longer on this sore, the point having been so vexed already betwixt the Historian and the Observator, that I shall not trouble it any further.

FULLER.—I confess, casual homicide not expressly mentioned, but implied, in the Commission. Otherwise what did those words import, "*could not* in his person attend?" It was not any indisposition of body,—being then, and some years after, in health ; not impotency in his intellect, (caused from the influence of age,) who afterwards, when older, discharged this place, as the Animadvertor confesseth. Though therefore the hilt of homicide was only shown, the blade was shaken in the sheath. Sure I am, that some, the nearest about the archbishop, have informed me, that he interpreted that UN-COULDING him, solely to relate to his canonical irregularity on the accident aforesaid, and was dejected accordingly.

DR. HEYLIN.—Only I must crave leave to rectify our author in another passage, relating to that sad accident.

FULLER.—*To rectify* is "to make that straight which was crooked before;" and it is an act of no less charity, than skill and cunning, well to perform it. Only fools can be fond of their own deformity. I do not only desire, but delight, to have the crookedness of my knowledge straightened, provided always it be done in the spirit of meekness. But I understand, such as straighten crooked persons beyond the seas put them to much torture. I likewise fear, that the Animadvertor will lay so much weight of ill words upon me, that the profit I shall reap will not countervail the pain I must endure in my rectification. Our author saith :—

237. DR. HEYLIN. "For which," saith he, "it would be of dangerous consequence to condemn him by the Canons of foreign Councils, which were never allowed any legislative power in this land." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 350.) Which words are very ignorantly spoken, or else very improperly.

FULLER.—Did I not foretell aright, that my rectification would cost me dear? even the burden of bad words. Here I have a doleful dilemma presented unto me, to confess myself speaking either very *ignorantly* or very *improperly*. But might not one of these two VERYS have very well been spared? Well, *e malis minimum* ; if it must be so, that my choice must be of one of these, let it be rather but impropriety than ignorance.

But, reader, I see no necessity of acknowledging either, but that my words are both knowingly and properly spoken ; and now to the trial.

DR. HEYLIN.—For if by “legislative power” he means “a power of making laws,” as the word doth intimate, then it is true, that the Canons of foreign Councils had never any such power within this land. But if by “legislative power” he means “a power or capability of passing for laws within this kingdom ;” then (though he use the word improperly) it is very false, that no such Canons were in force in the realm of England. The Canons of many foreign Councils, general, national, and provincial, had been received in this church, and incorporated into the body of the Canon Law, by which the church proceeded in the exercise of her jurisdiction, till the submission of the clergy to king Henry VIII. And, in the Act confirmative of that submission, it is said expressly, “That all Canons, Constitutions, Ordinances, and Synodals provincial, as were made before the said submission, which be not contrary or repugnant to the laws, statutes, and customs of this realm, nor to the damage or hurt of the king’s prerogative royal, were to be used and executed as in former times,” 25 Henry VIII. c. 19. So that unless it can be proved, that the proceedings in this case, by the Canons of foreign Councils, were either “contrary or repugnant to the laws and customs of the realm, or to the damage of the king’s prerogative royal,” there is no dangerous consequence at all to be found therein.

FULLER.—By “*legislative power* of the Canons of foreign Councils,” I understand “their power to subject the people of our nation to guiltiness, and consequently to penalties, if found infringing them.” Now I say again, Such foreign Canons, though not *against* but only *besides* our Common Law, and containing no *repugnancy* but *disparateness* to the laws of our land, either never had such power in England since the Reformation, or else disuse long since hath antiquated it, as to the rigid exercise thereof.

For instance : A bishop, I am sure, and I think a priest too, is, in the old Canons, rendered irregular for playing a game at tables ; dice being forbidden by the Canons. Yet I conceive, it would be hard measure, and a thing, *de facto*, never done, that such irregularity should be charged on him on that account.

We know it was the project of the pope and papal party, to multiply Canons in Councils, merely to make *the more men*—and *men the more*—obnoxious unto him, that they might re-purchase their innocence at the price of the Court of Rome. I believe, the Animadvertor himself would be loath to have his canonicalness tried by the test of all old Canons, made *in rigorem disciplinæ*, yet not contrariant to our laws and customs ; seeing they are so nice and numerous that cautiousness itself may be found an offender therein. I resume my words,—that it would be of dangerous consequence to condemn the archbishop by Canons of foreign Councils, which



never obtained power here, either *quoad reatum*, or *pœnam*, of such as did not observe them.

238. DR. HEYLIN.—But whereas our author adds, in some following words, that “ever since” (he means ever since the unhappy accident) “he had executed his jurisdiction without any interruption;” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 350;) I must needs add, that he is very much mistaken in this particular. Dr. Williams, lord elect of Lincoln; Dr. Carew, lord elect of Exeter; and Dr. Laud, lord elect of St. David’s, and, I think, some others, refusing to receive episcopal consecration from him upon that account.

FULLER.—*Must the Animadvertor needs add this?* I humbly conceive no such necessity, being but just the same which I myself had written before:—

“Though some squeamish and nice-conscienced Elects scrupled to be consecrated by him.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 288.)

But I beheld this as no effectual interrupting of his jurisdiction; because other bishops, more in number, (no whit their inferior,) received consecration, (Dr. Davenant, Dr. Hall,) and king Charles himself his coronation, from him.

239. DR. HEYLIN.—Far more mistaken is our author in the next, in which he telleth us: “Though this archbishop survived some years after, yet henceforward he was buried to the world.” (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 350.) No such matter neither. For, though for a while he stood confined to his house at Ford, yet neither this confinement nor that Commission was of long continuance; for, about Christmas, in the year 1628, he was restored both to his liberty and to his jurisdiction, sent for to come unto the Court, received as he came out of his barge by the archbishop of York and the earl of Dorset, and by them conducted to the king; who, giving him his hand to kiss, enjoined him not to fail the Council-table twice a-week. After which time we find him sitting as archbishop in the following Parliament, and in the full exercise of his jurisdiction till the day of his death, which happened upon Sunday, August 4th, 1633. And so much for him.

FULLER.—An Historian may make this exception, but not a divine; my words being spoken in the language of the apostle: “The world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world,” Gal. vi. 14. I had said formerly, that “the Keeper’s death was this archbishop’s mortification.” But from this his suspension (from the exercise of his jurisdiction) he was in his own thoughts buried, it reviving his obnoxiousness for his former casual homicide; so that never he was seen heartily (if at all) to laugh hereafter, though I deny not, much court-favour was afterwards (on design) conferred on him.

Here, I hope, it will be no offence to insert this innocent story,

partly to show how quickly tender-guiltiness is dejected, partly to make folk cautious, how they cast out galling speeches in this kind. This archbishop returning to Croydon, (after his late absence thence a long time,) many people, most women, (whereof some of good quality for good-will,) for novelty and curiosity crowded about his coach. The archbishop, being unwilling to be gazed at, and never fond of females, said, somewhat churlishly, "What make these women here?" "You had best," said one of them, "to shoot an arrow at us." I need not tell the reader how near *this second arrow* went to his heart. Our author goeth on:—

240, 241. DR. HEYLIN.—"My pen, passing by them at the present, may safely salute them with a 'God-speed,' as neither seeing nor suspecting any danger in the design." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 362.) Our author speaks this of the feoffees, appointed by themselves, for buying-in such impropriations as were then in the hands of lay persons. I say, "appointed by themselves;" because not otherwise authorized, either by charter from the king, decree in Chancery, or by Act of Parliament; but only by a secret combination of the brotherhood, to advance their projects. For though our author tells us, that "they were legally settled in trust" to make such purchases; (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 361;) yet there is more required to a legal settlement, than the consent of some few persons amongst themselves: for want whereof, this combination was dissolved, the feoffees in some danger of sentence, and the impropriations by them purchased adjudged to the king, on a full hearing of the cause in the Court of Exchequer, *anno* 1632. Howsoever, our author "wishes them 'God-speed,' as neither seeing nor suspecting any danger in their design;" but other men as wise as he did not only suspect but see the danger. And this our author might see also, if zeal to the good cause had not darkened the eyes of his understanding.

For, First, the parties trusted in the managing of this design were of such affections as promised no good unto the peace and happiness of the church of England. Their names our author truly gives us, "four ministers, four Common-Lawyers, and four citizens;" men not unknown, to such as then lived and observed the conduct of affairs, to be averse unto the discipline of the church then by law established. And if such public mischiefs be presaged by astrologers from the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, though the first of them be a planet of a most sweet and gentle influence; what dangers, what calamities might not be feared from the conjunction of twelve such persons, of which there was not one that wished well to the present government? And therefore I may say of them as Domitius Ænobarbus said unto his friends, when they came to congratulate with him for the birth of Nero: *Nihil ex se et Agrippinâ nisi detestabile et malo publico nasci potuisse.\**

\* SÆTONIUS, *De Nerone*.

But, Secondly, this will further appear by their proceedings in the business ; not laying the impropriations, by them purchased, to the church or chapelry to which they had anciently belonged ; nor settling them on the incumbent of the place, as many hoped they would. That had been utterly destructive to their main design ; which was not to advantage the regular and established clergy, but to set up a new body of Lecturers in convenient places, for the promoting of the cause. And therefore, having bought an impropriation, they parcelled it out into annual pensions of forty or fifty pounds *per annum*, and therewith salaried some Lecturers in such market-towns, where the people had commonly less to do, and consequently were more apt to faction and innovation than in other places. Our author notes it of their predecessors, in Cartwright's days, that they preached most diligently in populous places ; " it being observed in England, that those who hold the helm of the pulpit always steer people's hearts as they please." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 101.) And he notes it also of these feoffees, that, in conformity hereunto, they set up a preaching ministry in places of greatest need ; not in such parish-churches to which the tithes properly belonged, but where they thought the word was most wanting, that is to say, most wanting to advance their project.

Thirdly. If we behold the men whom they made choice of, and employed in preaching in such market-towns as they had an eye on, either because most populous, or because capable of electing burgesses to serve in Parliament, they were for the most part Nonconformists, and sometimes such as had been silenced by their ordinary, or the High-Commission, for their factious carriage. And such an one was placed by Geering, one of the citizen-feoffees, in a town of Gloucestershire ; a fellow which had been outed of a Lecture near Sandwich by the archbishop of Canterbury, out of another in Middlesex by the bishop of London, out of a third in Yorkshire by the archbishop of York, out of a fourth in Hertfordshire by the bishop of Lincoln, and finally suspended from his ministry by the High-Commission ; yet thought the fittest man by Geering (as indeed he was) to begin this lecture.

Fourthly and finally. These pensions neither were so settled, nor these Lecturers so well established in their several places, but that the one might be withdrawn, and the other removed, at the will and pleasure of their patrons, if they grew slack and negligent in " the holy cause," or abated any thing at all of that fire and fury they first brought with them. Examples of which I know some, and have heard of more. And now I would fain know of our author, whether there be no danger to be seen or suspected in this design ; whether these feoffees in short time would not have had more chaplains to depend upon them, than all the bishops in the kingdom ; and, finally, whether such needy fellows, depending on the will and pleasure of their gracious masters, must not be forced to preach such doctrines only as best please their humours. And though I shall say nothing here of their

giving underhand private pensions, not only unto such as had been silenced or suspended in the ecclesiastical courts, but many times also to their wives and children after their decease, all issuing from this common stock : yet others have beheld it as the greatest piece of wit and artifice both to encourage and increase their emissaries, which could be possibly devised. If, as our author tells us, “the design was generally approved, and that both discreet and devout men were doleful at the ruin of so pious a project ;” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 372 ;) it was because they neither did suspect the danger, nor foresee the mischiefs, which unavoidably must have followed, if not crushed in time.

FULLER.—The feoffees being now all dead, save one,\* I may say that in this suit all the counsel is for the plaintiff, and none allowed the defendant. Were any number of them still alive, probably they might plead something in defence of their proceedings.

However, I believe, this narrative of the Animadvertor hath very much of truth therein ; and seeing it is not *opposite*, but *additional*, to what I have written, my answer is not required thereunto. Only the close thereof treadeth on the toes of my History, and that but lightly too ; the Animadvertor not denying, “that discreet and devout men were doleful at the ruin of so pious a project.” And seeing he went so far with my words, would he had gone a little farther, and added, that such good men “were desirous of a regulation of this design ;” it being pity that so fair a tree should be rent up root and branch, for bearing bad—which might and would have borne better—fruit, with a little good digging about it, and well husbanding thereof.† Our author proceeds :—

243. DR. HEYLIN.—“However, there was no express in this Declaration, that the ministers of the parish should be pressed to the publishing.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 377.) Our author doth here change his style. He had before told us, that, on the first publishing of the Declaration about lawful sports on the Lord’s day, no minister was, *de facto*, enjoined to read it in his parish ; (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 273 ;) and here he tells us, that there was no express order in the Declaration, (when revived by king Charles,) that the minister of the parish should be pressed to the publishing of it ; adding withal, that many thought it a more proper work for the constable or tithing-man, than it was for the minister. But if our author mark it well, he may easily find, that the Declaration of king James was commanded to be published “by order from the bishop of the diocess, through all the parish churches”

\* I am informed, C. Offspring is still alive.

† A project, similar in many of its features, has been recently carried into effect, by the late Rev. Charles Simeon, the venerated Fellow of King’s College, Cambridge, and others his co-adjutors ; and seems to have excited very little alarm.—EDIT.

of his jurisdiction ; \* and the Declaration of king Charles, to be published, with like order “from the several bishops, through all the parish churches of their several diocesses respectively.”† *The bishop* of the diocess in the singular number, in the Declaration of king James, because it principally related to the county of Lancaster ; *the bishops* in the plural number, in that of king Charles, because the benefit of it was to be extended over all the realm. In both, the bishops are commanded to take order for the publishing of them in their several parishes ; and whom could they require to publish them in the parish churches, but the ministers only ? The constable is a lay-officer, merely bound by his place to execute the warrants and commands of the Justices, but not of the Bishop. And though the tithing-man have some relation to church-matters, and consequently to the bishop, in the way of presentments ; yet was he not bound to execute any such commands, because not tied by an oath of canonical obedience, as the ministers were. So that the bishops did no more than they were commanded, in laying the publication of these Declarations on the backs of the ministers ; and the ministers, by doing less than they were required, infringed the oath which they had taken, rendering themselves thereby obnoxious to all such ecclesiastical censures as the bishops should inflict upon them.

FULLER.—I said, that there was no express order in the Declaration, that the minister of the parish should be pressed to the publishing of it.

Now the Animadvertor hath done me the favour to prove my words to be true, acknowledging the Declaration only enjoined, “that the bishop of the diocess should order the publishing thereof, through all the parishes in his jurisdiction :” and so consequently (as the Animadvertor *inferreth*) the ministers must do it. Hereby the truth of my words do appear, that there was no express command, seeing *an express* and *an inference* are two things of a different nature.

Whereas I said, “that many thought it a more proper work for the constable or tithing-man, than for the minister ;” there are thousands now alive which will justify the truth thereof. Yea, their thoughts (which otherwise I confess came not under my cognizance) expressed themselves in their words, wherewith they affirmed and professed the same.

244—246. DR. HEYLIN.—It seems that, in our author’s judgment, it was well done by the Judges for the county of Somerset, to impose upon the ministers of that county (over whom they could challenge no authority) to publish their own Declarations against wakes and feasts ; and that it was well done of the ministers to obey the same, for which

\* “ Declaration about Sports,” p. 14.

† *Idem*, p. 17.

see Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 376. These bishops are beholden to him, for giving greater power to the Judges and Justices over his brethren of the clergy, than he yields to them ; and as much beholden are the clergy, for putting *so many masters* over them, instead of a *father*. The difference of the case will not serve the turn ; the king having a greater power to indulge such freedom to his subjects, than the others could pretend unto, to restrain them from it. If he object, that “ the ministers are most unfit to hold the candle to lighten and let-in licentiousness,” as he seems to do ; he must first prove, that all or any of the sports allowed of in those Declarations may be brought within the compass of *licentiousness* ; which neither the word of God, nor the Canons of the Christian church, nor any Statutes of the realm had before forbidden. Lastly. Whereas he tells us, that “ because the Judges had enjoined the ministers to read their order in the church, the king’s Declaration was enforced by the bishops to be published by them in the same place ;” there is no such matter. The Declaration of king James appointed to be read, and read by order of the bishop in the parish churches, doth evince the contrary.

FULLER.—I did not say, the Judges did well, or did ill therein ; but I said, the Judges *did order* that the ministers should publish their Declaration against wakes and feasts. I have not (nor can quickly procure) a copy of their Order, whether it were mandatory, or, by way of advice, did desire ministers to do that which might be advantageous to religion. But I will not judge the Judges, but leave them (as best-skilled in their own faculty) to make good their own acts.

If such grandees in the law exceeded their bounds in this their injunction to ministers, (over whom they had no command,) how many mistakes should I run into, if once offering to meddle with this matter, being out of my profession ! And therefore no more thereof.

247. DR. HEYLIN.—Now, for our author’s better satisfaction in the present point, I shall lay down the judgment of one so high in his esteem, (and once in the esteem of that party too,) that I conceive he will not offer to gainsay him. It is the author of the book called, “ The Holy Table, Name and Thing,” who resolves it thus : “ All the commands of the king,” saith he, “ that are not upon the first inference and illation (without any prosyllogisms) contrary to a clear passage in the word of God, or to an evident sunbeam of the law of nature, are precisely to be obeyed. Nor is it enough to find a remote and possible inconvenience that may ensue therefrom ; (which is the ordinary objection against the Book of Recreations ;) for every good subject is bound in conscience to believe and rest assured, that his prince (enviored with such a Council) will be more able to discover, and as ready to prevent, any ill sequel that may come of it, as himself possibly can be. And

therefore I must not by disobeying my prince commit a certain sin, in preventing a probable but contingent inconveniency." \* This, if it were good doctrine then, when both the author and the book were cried up even to admiration, is not to be rejected as false doctrine now ; truth being constant to itself, not varying nor altering with the change of times.

FULLER.—I want no satisfaction, I thank God, in the point ; and therefore the Animadvertor might have spared his pains. As an Historian, I have truly related, *de facto*, what was done ; and though the Animadvertor may conjecture at my judgment in this controversy, he cannot be confident thereof by any thing I have written.

All I will add is this : Because I may write the more, I will write the less, of this subject. I have good power to back me for the present in this controversy, and might securely express myself therein.

When my text shall lead me in my vocation to treat of the observation of the Lord's day, I shall not be sparing to express my opinion therein, and will endeavour (God willing) to justify it. Meantime, I will not go out of mine own house, which is my castle ; I mean, I will not be drawn out into the open field of a controversy, but keep myself under this cover,—that matters of fact in this difference have been truly related by me : and let the Animadvertor disprove it, if he can.

248. DR. HEYLIN.—But our author will not stop here, he goes on and saith,—

"Many moderate men are of opinion, that this abuse of the Lord's day was a principal procurer of God's anger, since poured out on this land in a long and bloody civil war." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 378.) And *moderate* perhaps they may be in apparel, diet, and the like civil acts of life and conversation ; but, sure, *immoderate* enough in this observation. "For who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor ?" saith the great apostle. But it is as common, with some men of the newest religions, to ascribe God's secret judgments to some special reasons, as if they had the key which opens into his cabinet at their several girdles ; as if they were admitted to all consultations in the Court of heaven, before that dreadful Judge could inflict any temporal punishment upon men on earth. Otherwise they might find the nation guilty of too many sins, which drew down this vengeance, to ascribe it unto any one sin ; (if a sin it were ; ) and rather wonder at God's mercy, patience, and longsuffering, in deferring his punishments long, than that he inflicted them at last.

FULLER.—I behold them as "moderate men" in all respects.

\* "Holy Table," c. iv. p. 68.



The Animadvertor hath used my words, as the king of Ammon dealt with the clothes of David's ambassadors, even cutting them off at the middle, 2 Sam. x. 4. Otherwise, might they have but hung down to the ground, no nakedness had appeared in what I have written, proceeding as followeth :—

“Such moderate men observe, that our fights of chief concernment, (Edge-hill, &c.) were often fought on the Lord's day, as pointing at the punishing of the profanation thereof.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 378.)

See here the reason assigned of their opinion, as I received it from their mouths. Since, they say, It is one thing with the Bethshemites to pry into the ark, and another thing to look on God's secrets, in some sort unsecreted, when, by the proportion of his judgments, he saith, “Come and see.” These also allege for themselves, that the patriarchs, sensible of their hard usage from the governor of Egypt, did not pry into God's mystical pleasure, when concluding it inflicted on them for their cruelty to their brother Joseph : “Therefore is this distress come upon us,” Gen. xlii. 21. However, I wholly concur with the Animadvertor in his last sentence, as truly and savourily written. Only I dissent from him, in that passage ; (*if a sin it were ;*) surely, he meaneth not, “If the profanation of the Lord's day were a sin,” which is above all ifs. Rather his sense is, “If the using of such sports were a profanation of the Lord's day.”

But men's corruption is more prone to acquit themselves when guilty, than to suspect themselves when guiltless.

*Parce, precor, stimulis, et fortius utere loris.*

“Spurs, I pray, refrain ;  
Rather use the rein.”

I need not mind the Animadvertor, how penal it is by the late Act for any to write any thing against the strict observation of the Lord's day ; and believe he intended nothing prejudicial to the same : yet profaneness probably too soon (besides his intention) may improve itself on his words, alter his *si* into *non* ; and, by the *next return*, turn his note of dubitation into an absolute negation, on which account the parenthesis had been better forborne, in my opinion.

DR. HEYLIN.—And though our author doth object against this opinion of those moderate men, that “to pick a solemn providence out of a common casualty, savours more of curiosity than conscience,” yet he dares not stand to it ; confessing within few lines after, that “there may be more in the observation than what many are willing to acknowledge.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 379.) If so, there may be as

much conscience as curiosity in those moderate men, of whom our author tells us further, that,—

FULLER.—As I stand not wholly to it, so I run not any whit away from it, but dubiously propound it, hoping the reader will account me not the less constant in my judgment, but the more cautious in my language, in not being positive in an observation of this nature. Our author proceeds:—

249. DR. HEYLIN.—“If moderate men had had the managing of these matters about the posture of the Lord’s board, (call it table or altar,) the accommodation had been easy with a little condescension on both sides.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 382.) Why then did not these moderate men interpose themselves for taking off those “needless animosities,” and putting an end unto the quarrel? The press was open on both sides; John Lincoln, dean of Westminster, who appeared so strongly in the cause, thinking himself as well-able and well-qualified to license a book unto the press, as either the archbishop of Canterbury, or the bishop of London.

FULLER.—I said it, and say it again, and any who have honesty and learning (the Animadvertor only excepted) will say so too,—that those differences were easily capable of “accommodations with a little condescension on both sides.” It will not be long before the Animadvertor will tell us, that the controversies betwixt us and the church of Rome (consisting most, as he saith, in superstructures) may be compromised. “And if,” to use his own words, “the petulancy of the Puritans on the one side, and the pragmaticalness of the Jesuits on the other side, were charmed awhile, moderate men might possibly have agreed on equal terms.”

Now this seemeth a strange thing to me, that *moderation* may make protestants agree with papists *in matters doctrinal*; and cannot make protestants agree with protestants *in matters ceremonial*. Being the same plaster, why hath it not equal virtue? especially, the latter being the lesser wound. Can the difference of transubstantiation be taken up betwixt us and the papists, and not the setting of the communion-table betwixt ourselves? Can a crack be closed in a JEWEL, and a rent not mended in the CASE? \* These things, I confess, transcend my apprehension.

Now that no moderate man stood up in the gap to make up this

\* This is one of those latent innuendoes which are of frequent occurrence in Fuller’s writings, and which, if fully explained, would drain the resources of the best-informed editor,—though they were easily comprehended by his contemporaries. We may gain some adequate conception of his double meaning in this sentence when we recollect, that JOHN JEWEL was one of the ablest defenders of the church of England *in matters doctrinal*, and that THOMAS CASE was a member of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, an amiable man, and a very clever champion of the Presbyterians *in matters ceremonial* as well as doctrinal.—EDIT.

breach, I can assign no other cause save, that God, justly offended with our nation, had not so great a favour for it, but suffered a pustule to fester into an ulcer; not from any insanability in the sore, but from want of seasonable surgery; and let the guilt thereof (that the burden may be the better borne) be equally divided betwixt both parties engaged therein.

DR. HEYLIN.—If all else failed, why did not our author undertake it, and make himself the Moderator in that “trifling controversy,” which seems to have been so “easy” to be brought to an accommodation?

FULLER.—The jeer shall go for nothing. The reason why the author undertook not to be Moderator in the difference, was, because he was *Ἐλαχιστότερος*, (and if there be a more subter-supulative,) “the least of the least of his brethren,” Eph. iii. 8. However, herein the author comforteth himself,—that as it was above his power to cure, so it was against his will to widen, the wound; and being quiet in his calling, concurred not to the inflaming of the mutual animosities.

DR. HEYLIN.—Make himself the Moderator in that “trifling controversy.”

FULLER.—The Animadvertor’s unfair dealing with me minds me of a passage in Cambridge. One made a (pretended) extemporary confutation of his position against whom he disputed, which indeed was only premeditatedly made against the question, confuting many things which the answerer never spake. And when the answerer, causelessly charged, pleaded for himself, *Nihil tale occurrebat in positione meâ*, the other replied, *Debuit occurrere tamen*. I never said, that the controversy about placing of the communion-table was a trifling controversy; but it seems I should have said so, that the Animadvertor might have had an advantage against me. This I said, that “the controversy might easily have been reconciled with mutual moderation;” but “trifling,” I never termed it. And therefore, the Animadvertor fighting with his own shadow, it is all one to me whether he beat or be beaten.

Yet I doubt not but there are many in this nation, my betters in all respects, who will be bold to call it “a trifling controversy,” if not absolutely, yet comparatively, to many doctrinal differences of higher concernment; and, in respect of the great troubles caused thereby, far above the considerableness of the thing which was in contest.

DR. HEYLIN.—The question was about the placing of the communion-table, whether it ought to stand in the middle of the church, or chancel, with one end towards the east great window, like a common table; or close up to the eastern wall, with ends north and south, according as the altars had been placed in the former times. They

that maintained the last opinion had authority for it ; that is to say, the Injunctions of the queen, *anno* 1599 ; the orders and advertisements of the years 1562 and 1565 ; the constant practice of the chapels in his majesty's houses, most of the cathedral and some of the parochial churches ; and, finally, a Declaration of the king, *anno* 1633, commending a conformity in the parish churches to their own cathedrals. They on the other side stood chiefly upon discontinuance ; but urged withal, that some Rubrics in the Common-Prayer Book seemed to make for them. So that the question being reduced to a matter of fact, that is to say, "The table must stand this way, or it must stand that way ;" I would fain know, how any "condescension" might be made on either side, tending to an accommodation, or what our Moderator would have done to at-one\* the differences.

FULLER.—The doctor hath clearly, briefly, and truly stated the controversy, whose pen was formerly conversant therein ; and, by his own acknowledgment, both sides had much to say for themselves.

Only I wonder, that, though the question was "reduced to matter of fact," it should be made by him of so high importance ; that either no condescension could be made on either side, or such condescension (if made) must prove ineffectual as to an accommodation.

Is there no balm in Gilead ? Hath not the Spirit of God endowed his servants with such discretion, but they may compromise a difference of greater moment ?

DR. HEYLIN.—Suppose him sitting in the Chair, the arguments on both sides urged, and all the audience full of expectation which side would carry it. The Moderator, FULLER of old merry tales than ordinary, thus resolves the business :—That he had heard it commended for a great piece of wisdom in bishop Andrews, "that wheresoever he was a parson, a dean, or a bishop, he never troubled parish, college, or diocess, with pressing of other ceremonies upon them, than such which he found used there before his coming thither : " (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 349 :) That king James, finding the archbishop of Spalato in a resolution of questioning all such leases as had been made by his predecessors in the Savoy, gave him this wise counsel, *Relinque res sicut eas invenisti* ; that "he should leave things as he found them : " (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 298 :) That the said king, being told by a great person of the inverted situation of a chapel in Cambridge, made answer, that "it did not matter how the chapel stood, so their hearts who go thither were set aright in God's service : " (*Idem*, vol. iii. p. 382 :) But, for his part, he liked better of the resolution of Dr. Prideaux,

\* Heylin employs "atone," in this and in a subsequent passage, as Chaucer and our earlier writers have done, in an active sense, to signify *to make at one, to reconcile*. The word was sometimes written "at-tone," which conveys a similar leading idea in reference to music,—*to bring into tune or concord*.—EDIT.

(his brother in the Chair at Oxford,) who, being troubled with his neighbours of Kidlington, about the setting up of a May-pole, some being for it, and some against it, thus resolved the case: "You," saith he, "that will have a May-pole, shall have a May-pole; and you that will have none, shall have none:" and that, according to that pattern, he thought best to accommodate the present controversy to the same effect, namely, "You that will have an altar, shall set up your altar; and you that will have a table, shall have but a table." Which sentence, whether it would have pleased all parties, I do somewhat doubt; but sure I am, it had not tended to the advancement of that uniformity which was then designed.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor here makes a Professor's Chair; and, having solemnly set me down therein, puts words into my mouth, and makes an oration for me, as Moderator in the present controversy, with a jeer to boot on the memory of the reverend Doctor Prideaux.

But know, there is another chair, which David calls "the chair of the scornful," Psalm i. 1; and it is to be feared, that the Animadvertor in this point is too near sitting down therein.

If I should retaliate, and accordingly place the Animadvertor in a chair, and fit him with a speech personating him proportionable to his principles, possibly I might render him as ridiculous, but most of all should abuse myself and my own profession therein.

I thank God I can, though plainly, yet pertinently enough to my purpose, speak to express the notions of my mind. And when God shall take speech from me, (if my reason still remain,) I shall rather with Zacharias make signs for writing-tables to write in, than to have words put into my mouth, forced and feigned on me by the Animadvertor. Let him thank God that he can speak so well for himself; and I will be content, as well as I can, to utter my own conceptions.

It would never have come into my mind to have compared the table of the Lord to a May-pole; the wood of the one grew in Paradise; not so the other, being a light, and ludicrous, and too often profane, stock of wood. I hope that the principles of my education will restrain me from profaneness in such unfitting parallels.

Whereas the Animadvertor says, that "an expedient would not have tended to that *uniformity* that was designed herein;" before God and man I will speak out my thoughts:—That *multiformity* with mutual charity advanceth God's glory, as much as *uniformity* itself in matters merely indifferent; which, as the pipes of an organ, may be of several length and bigness, yet all tuned into good harmony together.

I will instance in the observation of Easter, the great controversy betwixt the eastern and western church in the observation thereof; betwixt that which I may call "style oriental" and "style occidental" for the date thereof. And I verily believe that God was equally honoured by both, by such as religiously observed it.

250, 251. DR. HEYLIN.—But from these moderate men, who were so in contemplation only, let us proceed to one who was such in practice, (the lord bishop of London,) of whom he saith: "He had a perfect command of his passion, an happiness not granted all clergymen in that age, though privy-counsellors." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 380.) So perfect a man of his own passion and affections, that he will not think himself honoured with a commendation which comes accompanied with the disparagement of his chiefest friend; for that this lash was made for the archbishop of Canterbury, no wise man can doubt. Our author might have spared the dead, without any wrong to the living; but that he thinks no topic so useful in his Logic, as the rule of contraries. *Contraria juxta se posita magis elucescunt.* Upon which ground, the better to set off bishop Andrews, this poor archbishop must be charged with want of moderation, "in enjoining his own private practices and opinions upon other men." And here, that bishop Juxon might appear with the greater lustre, the said archbishop, with all his passion and infirmities, must stand by for a foil. He had indeed no such command upon his passions as to be at all times of equal temper, especially when wearied with the business of the Council-Table, and the High-Commission. But, as he was soon hot, so he was soon cooled; and so much is observed by sir Edward Deering, though his greatest adversary, and the first that threw dirt in his face in the late Long Parliament; who telleth us of him, that "the roughness of his uncourtly nature sent most men discontented from him; but so that he would often (of himself) find ways and means to sweeten many of them again, when they least looked for it." \* In this, more modest than our author; who gives us nothing of this prelate but his wants and weaknesses. But of this reverend prelate he will give cause to speak more hereafter.

FULLER.—There were other clergymen privy-counsellors beside archbishop Laud; (Dr. Abbot, Neile, Harsnet, Williams, &c.) and therefore the Animadvertor's collection of my words cannot be conclusive in reference to archbishop Laud.

I confess elsewhere I do reckon anger amongst his personal imperfections, which a historian may do without any wrong at all; (the Spirit of God saying, "Elias was subject to like passions as we are," James v. 17;) I am confident, as angry as archbishop Laud was, he would not have been angry with me for writing of it, as sensible of and sorrowful for his own imperfection therein.

\* "Collection of Speeches," p. 5.

I am much of the mind of sir Edward Deering, that the roughness of his un-court-like nature sweetened many men when they least looked for it, surprising some of them (and myself for one) with unexpected courtesies. But whereas I am accused for giving in nothing of this prelate but his wants and weaknesses, it will not be long before my innocence herein will appear.

DR. HEYLIN.—Let us now on unto another of a different judgment, his professed enemy, Mr. Prinne; of whom thus our author: “Mr. William Prinne was born about Bath in Gloucestershire, &c. began with the writing of some orthodox books.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 383.) In this story of Mr. Prinne and his sufferings, our author runs into many errors, which either his love to the man, or zeal to the good cause, or carelessness of what he writes, have brought upon him.

FULLER.—If I have run into so many errors, it will be charity in the Animadvertor fairly to lead me back again a foot-pace into the truth, and then he shall have thanks for his pains: always provided, he doth not pinch me by the arm as he conducteth me, which will turn my thanks into anger. But seeing the Animadvertor careth for both alike from my hands, let him do as he pleaseth.

Next we have his tripartite history of my errors, which he will have to proceed from one of these three causes:—

1. *Love to the person of Mr. Prinne.* To whom I profess I have no fondness; but liking the motto of Luther, *In quo aliquid Christi video, illum diligo*, I must on that account have a kindness for him.

2. *Zeal to their good cause.* Which I behold as a jeer, and treading on the toes of scripture: “It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing.” Galatians iv. 18.

3. *Carelessness of what I write.*

But seeing now the Animadvertor’s hand is in his arithmetic, in counting of causes of my mistakes, his charity might have found a fourth, (worth all the other three,) and imputed my errors to that infirmity which always attendeth human nature. However, let us proceed.

252. DR. HEYLIN.—Whereas our author telleth us, that Mr. William Prinne was born about Bath in Gloucestershire, Bath is not in Gloucestershire, but a chief city in the county of Somerset.

FULLER.—These are ANI-MAD-VERSIONS indeed, when a writer’s words are *madly-verted*, *inverted*, *perverted*, against his true intent and their grammatical sense.

My words run thus: “Mr. William Prinne was born (about Bath) in Gloucestershire;” where Bath is walled about with a parenthesis, not essential to the sentence, thus perfect without it: “Mr. William Prinne was born in Gloucestershire.” These walls



the Animadvertor hath most disingenuously dismantled, to lay Bath open ; and, if possible, to bring it into Gloucestershire, that so he may have something to cavil at me.

Indeed Bath is not *in*, but *within* three miles of, Gloucestershire ; and the next eminent place to [Swainswick] the village of Mr. Prinne's nativity. When towns stand in the confines of two counties, is it not proper enough to say ?—"Such a one was born (about London) in Surrey," though London be in Middlesex ; or " (about Windsor) in Buckinghamshire," though Windsor be in Berkshire ?

Mr. Fox, writing in his own defence against such as traduced him : "Some," saith he, "do not cavil because they have found fault ; but do find faults because they may cavil." And be it reported to the reader, whether the Animadvertor may be accounted one of them. And now the Animadvertor, having a little refreshed himself in my Cross-Bath, and somewhat pleased his spirit of opposition, he thus proceedeth :—

253. DR. HEYLIN.—Secondly. Though I look on Mr. Prinne (so far forth as I am able to judge, by some books of his not long since published) as a man of a far more moderate spirit, than I have done formerly ;\* yet can I not think his first books to have been so orthodox as our author makes them. For, not to say any thing of his "Perpetuity," &c.

FULLER.—But I must and will say something of his "Perpetuity of the Regenerate Man's Estate," as being that which is particularly named in my margin, and chiefly intended by me : a book wherein an useful, necessary, and comfortable truth is learnedly defended : a book, which will perpetuate the memory of the writer ; who, had he proceeded, and continued as he began, none could have taken just exception at, or got just advantage against, him.

DR. HEYLIN.—Not to say any thing of his "Perpetuity," his books entituled, "Lame Giles's Haltings," "Cosin's cozening Devotions," and his Appendix to another, have many things repugnant to the rules and canons of the church of England. No greater enemy against bowing at the name of Jesus, nor greater enemy to some

\* Pryne had secured a warm place in Heylin's affections, by his violent opposition to Cromwell's government, and by his strenuous and sincere exertions in aid of those who were then engaged in procuring the restoration of the royal family. This was a course pursued by many wise men of Pryne's party : during several years of varying misrule, they had become gradually attached to the venerable institutions connected with the altar and the throne, which they had themselves assisted to overturn ; and they were disgusted with the inconsistent conduct of others, who had originally been the loudest declaimers against tyranny, but who, in accordance with all revolutionary experience, had afterwards proved themselves to be among the most determined enemies of civil liberty and the rights of conscience.—EDIT.

ceremonies here by law established. In which particulars if our author think him to be orthodox, he declares himself to be no true son of the church of England.

FULLER.—I confess, in this his numerous offspring, his younger children were not so vigorous as his first-born, termed in the scripture “the might and beginning of their fathers’ strength,” Gen. xlix. 3: they were of a weaker and sicker constitution, and some passages in them I do not approve. I hope to acquit myself so dutiful a son to the church of England, that, when in a reverent posture I shall crave her blessing, she will give it me in as full and free a manner and measure as to the Animadvertor himself.

254. DR. HEYLIN.—Thirdly. The book called “*Histrio-Mastix*” was not written by Mr. Prinne about three years before his last sufferings, as our author telleth us; for then it must be written or published *anno* 1634; whereas, indeed, that book was published in print about the latter end of 1632, and the author censured in Star-Chamber for some passages in it, about the latter end of the year 1633. Otherwise, had it been as our author telleth us, the punishment must have preceded the offence; and he must suffer for a book which was not published at that time; and perhaps not written. But our author hath a special faculty in this kind, which few writers have.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor hath a special faculty in cavilling without cause. My clock of time strikes true enough, but that he is minded not to tell it aright. My words are, “Some three years since;” which word *some* soundeth an interpretative *plus minùs* to all ingenuous ears. Besides, this is our opposite marginal note, (containing the contents of that paragraph,) “Mr. Prinne accused for libelling against bishops;” which accusation was about two years before this his last censure, during which time he was imprisoned. And my “*some* three years” are to bear date (in the construction of any impartial reader) from that his accusation; and then nothing is mistimed, but falleth out in due season.

And now, reader, judge where the many errors be into which I have run, in the story of Mr. Prinne and his sufferings, seeing no one mistake can be produced and proved against me. And seeing the first book of Mr. Prinne was sound in itself, in my opinion; and his last books more moderate, even in the judgment of the Animadvertor; and his middling books (how faulty soever) such for which he hath severally suffered; let us even take a fair farewell of Mr. Prinne and his books, and so proceed.

DR. HEYLIN.—For as he post-dateth his “*Histrio-Mastix*,” by making it come into the world two years after it did; so he antedates a book of Dr. White, then lord bishop of Ely, which he makes to be published two years sooner than indeed it was. That book of his,

entituled, "A Treatise of the Sabbath," came not out till Michaelmas, *anno* 1635, though placed by our author as then written, *anno* 1633; for which, see Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 373.

FULLER.—In answer hereunto, may the reader be pleased to take notice of these particulars.

1. The revived controversy, Lord's day, lasted ten years, bandied with books from 1628 till 1638.

2. I was loath to scatter my book with it, but resolved on one entire narrative thereof.

3. I fixed on the year 1633, therein to insert the same, because the middle number, from the rising to the sinking of the difference, then come to the very heat and height thereof.

4. Hence my narrative retreated some years back to 1628, when Bradborn began the difference.

5. Hence also it sallied forth to the year 1635, (when bishop White's book was set forth,) and beyond it.

6. The date of the year 1633 stands still unmovable on my margin; the whole relation being, for the reasons aforesaid, entered under it. So that nothing is offered to the reader unjointed in time, if I be but rightly understood.

255. DR. HEYLIN.—Next unto Mr. Prinne, in the course of his censure, comes the bishop of Lincoln, the cause whereof we have in our author, who having left a blank, (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 390,) for somewhat which he thinks not fit to make known to all, gives some occasion to suspect that the matter was far worse on the bishop's side than perhaps it was. And therefore, to prevent all further misconstructions in this business, I will lay down the story as I find it, thus: namely, "The bishop's purgation depending chiefly upon the testimony of one Prideon, it happened, that, the February after, one Elizabeth Hodson was delivered of a base child, and laid to this Prideon. The bishop, finding his great witness charged with such a load of filth and infamy, conceived it would invalidate all his testimony; and, that once rendered invalid, the bishop could easily prognosticate his own ruin; therefore he bestirs himself amain. And though, by order of the Justices at the public Sessions at Lincoln, Prideon was charged as the reputed father, the bishop, by his two agents, Powel and Owen, procured that order to be suppressed; and, by subornation and menacing of and tampering with witnesses, at length in May (10th of Charles) procured the child to be fathered upon one Boon, and Prideon acquit. Which lewd practices, for the supportation of his favourite's credit, cost the bishop, as he confessed to Sir John Munson and others, twelve hundred pounds; so much directly, and by consequence much more." \*

\* "History of King Charles," fol. 151.

FULLER.—I have concealed nothing herein of moment, (the blank being insignificant, and the mere mistake of the printer,\*) and expect no considerable addition from the Animadvertor, having in my book truly and clearly stated the bishop's cause from the best records.

I appeal to the impartial perusers of what I wrote, whether by this note any thing of moment is added to the matter in hand, except the naming of a light housewife, (which I conceived beneath my History,) the rest being truly by me related before.

256. DR. HEYLIN.—But, to proceed: The cause being brought unto a censure, "Secretary Windebank motioned to degrade him; which," saith he, "was lustily pronounced by a knight and layman, having no precedent for the same in former ages." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 391.) But, First, it is not very certain that any such thing was moved by sir Francis Windebank. A manuscript of that day's proceedings I have often seen, containing the decree and sentence, with the substance of every speech then made; and, amongst others, that of sir Francis Windebank, in which I find no motion tending to a degradation, nor any other punishment inflicted on him, than fine, suspension, and imprisonment; in which the residue of the Lord's concurred, as we find in our author.

FULLER.—It is very certain, he moved it, and I avow it from honourable eyes and ears. The Animadvertor misguides the reference of those my words, "having no precedent for the same in former ages," making them relate to the bishop's degradation; (whereof one precedent since the Reformation, *unus homo nobis*;) which indeed refer to the knight's and layman's first mentioning thereof, which is *unprecedented* I am sure, that such a person should first make such a motion against a bishop.

I confess, at bishop Middleton's degradation, some of the lay Privy-Counsellors were present, but acted little therein, (so far from first mentioning of it,) only concurring with the Court; the matter being chiefly managed by archbishop Whitgift, and some other bishops and deans the commissioners, as most proper persons to pass such a censure on one of their own profession.

DR. HEYLIN.—Secondly. It had been more strange if the knight had not been a layman, the church of England not acknowledging any Order of spiritual knighthood. Knights in divinity are greater strangers in this land, than lay divines; these last being multiplied of late, even *ad infinitum*; the first, never heard of.

FULLER.—The pleonasm of the addition of layman to knight is

\* Before his time, he was about to begin a new section and dedication, as appears by the "To" in the text.

not so culpable in itself, but that it might have passed without censure ; and let not the Animadvertor be over-confident herein.

I have been credibly informed, that sir Miles Sandys, (third son to Edwin archbishop of York,) Fellow of Peter-House in Cambridge, and Proctor of the University, *anno* 1588, was made a deacon, (and so no mere layman,) and in his younger years a prebendary of York. Within this twenty years there was one Mr. Seaton beneficed in Hertfordshire, a Scottish-man, and at this day a knight. But the matter being of no more moment, let us proceed.

257, 258. DR. HEYLIN.—And, Thirdly, had it been so moved, and so lustily moved, as our author makes it, the knight and layman might have found a precedent for it in former ages.

Which last clause is to be understood (as I suppose) with reference to the times since the Reformation. For in the former times, many precedents of like nature might be easily found. And being understood of the times since the Reformation, it is not so infallibly true but that one precedent of it, at the least, may be found amongst us. Marmaduke Middleton advanced to the bishopric of St. David's, *anno* 1567, after he had sat in that see three-and-twenty years, was finally condemned, (for many notable misdemeanours,) not only to be deprived of his bishopric, but degraded from all holy Orders. Which sentence was accordingly executed by and before the High-Commissioners at Lambeth-house, not only by reading it *in scriptis*, but by a formal divesting of him of his episcopal robes and priestly vestments,\* as I have heard by a person of good credit, who was present at it. And somewhat there is further in the story of this Marmaduke Middleton, which concerns the bishop now before us ; of whom our author telleth us further, that, being pressed by two bishops and three doctors, to answer upon oath to certain articles, which were tendered to him in the Tower, "he utterly refused to do it, claiming the privilege of a peer." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 394.) Which plea was also made by the said bishop of St. David's, offering to give-in his answer to such articles as were framed against him, *on his honour only*, but refusing to do it on his oath. Which case being brought before the Lords, then sitting in Parliament, was ruled against him ; it being ordered that he should answer upon oath, as in fine he did. To this bishop let us join his chaplain, Mr. Osbaldeston ; who, being engaged in the same bark with his patron, suffered shipwreck also, though not at the same time, nor on the same occasion ; censured in [the] Star-Chamber not only to lose his ecclesiastical promotions, but to corporal punishments.

FULLER.—In my weak judgment, the Animadvertor had better have omitted this passage (of the bishop's degradation) in this

\* With other ceremonies used at his bringing-in to the Court, and his thrusting out of it.

juncture of time, wherein the repute of that function runs very low, and their adversaries too ready to take all advantage to disgrace it ; the rather, because bishop Godwin taketh no notice at all thereof, but beginneth, continueth, and concludeth the life and death of this bishop in less than two lines : “ Marmaduke Middleton, translated from Ireland, died November 30th, 1592.” Our author proceedeth :—

259. DR. HEYLIN.—“ But this last personal penalty he escaped, by going beyond Canterbury, conceived seasonably gone beyond the seas, whilst he secretly concealed himself in London.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 403.) And he had escaped the last penalty, had he staid at home. For though Mr. Osbaldeston at that time conceived the archbishop to be his greatest enemy, yet the archbishop was resolved to show himself his greatest friend, assuring the author of these papers, (before any thing was known of Mr. Osbaldeston’s supposed flight,) that he would cast himself at the king’s feet for obtaining a discharge of that corporal punishment unto which he was sentenced. Which may obtain the greater credit, First, in regard that no course was taken to stop his flight, no search made after him, nor any thing done in order to his apprehension. And, Secondly, by Mr. Osbaldeston’s readiness to do the archbishop all good offices in the time of his troubles, upon the knowledge which was given him (at his coming-back) of such good intentions. But of these private men enough : pass we now to the public.

FULLER.—Whether or no he was sought after, I know not. This I know, he was not taken : and more [persons] do commend his wariness in his flight, than would have praised his valour for staying, in hope his punishment should be remitted. It had been most mercy to stop the denouncing—but was a good after-game of pity to stay the inflicting—of so cruel a censure on a clergyman. As the Animadvertor then had the credit to know—so the author now hath the charity to believe—the archbishop’s good resolution. .

However I cannot forget, that, when the sentence in the Star-Chamber passed on bishop Williams, (where he concurred with the highest in his fine,) he publicly professed, that he “ had fallen *five* times down on his knees before the king in the bishop’s behalf, but to no purpose.” It might be therefore suspected that his intention to do it *once* for Mr. Osbaldeston might not have taken effect. And therefore, had the archbishop’s good resolution been known unto him, Mr. Osbaldeston might most advisedly conceal himself.

## BOOK XI.

## PART II.

CONTAINING THE LAST TWELVE YEARS OF THE REIGN OF  
KING CHARLES.

DR. HEYLIN.—And now we come to the last and most unfortunate part of this king's reign, which ended in the loss of his own life, the ruin of the church, and the alteration of the civil government; occasioned *primarily*, as my author saith, by sending a new Liturgy to the kirk of Scotland.

FULLER.—I deny such a word, that I said the Liturgy did *primarily* occasion the war with Scotland: rather the clean contrary may, by charitable logic, be collected from my words, when, having reckoned up a complication of heart-burnings amongst the Scots, I thus conclude:—

“Thus was the Scottish nation full of discontents, when this book, being brought unto them, bare the blame of their breaking-forth into more dangerous designs; as when the cup is brim full before, the last (though least) superadded drop is charged alone to be the cause of all the running-over.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 399.)

Till then that the word *primarily* can be produced out of my book, let the Animadvertor be beheld, *primarily*, as one departed from the truth; and, *secondarily*, as a causeless accuser of his brother. For he thus proceeds:—

260. DR. HEYLIN.—“Miseries caused from the sending of the Book of Service or new Liturgy, thither, which may sadly be termed a *Rubric* indeed, *dyed* with the blood of so many of both nations, slain on that occasion.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 395.) Our author speaks this in relation to the Scottish tumults, *anno* 1637. In telling of which story he runs (as commonly elsewhere) into many errors. For, First, those miseries and that bloodshed were not caused by sending the Liturgy thither.

FULLER.—Seeing the Animadvertor denies the Liturgy to have had any causal influence on the Scots' war, I must manifest my dissent from his judgment. And here I crave the reader's leave to be his humble remembrancer of the kinds of causes, so far as they conduce to the clearing of the present controversy.

Causes are twofold: *ὀλικὴ αἰτία* “solitary or total,” or *μερικὴ αἰτία* “joint and fellow causes.” The latter again is twofold: *προηγούμενη*, *pro-egumena* “long leading before,” and inwardly disposing and



inclining to action; or *προκαταρκτική*, *procatartica*, (called also *causa irritatrix* or *primitiva provocans*,) which is outwardly impulsive to action.

The former is termed by physicians *causa antecedens*, the latter *causa evidens*, of a disease. Thus in a fever, “corrupt humours, bred within and without the veins,” are the antecedent cause thereof; whilst, *being in the hot sun, walking in the south wind, &c. stopping the pores, and stirring the ill humours to heat*, may be the evident cause of a fever.

I thus apply it: The inward discontents of the Scots on several accounts (which follow on the next paragraph) were the *antecedent causes* of their war; whilst the *evident cause* thereof was the obtruding the Liturgy upon them. And so much for my clear sense in this controversy.

261, 262. DR. HEYLIN.—The plot had been laid long before upon other grounds; that is to say, First, questioning of some church-lands, then in the hands of some great persons, of which they feared a revocation to the Crown. And, Secondly, the manumitting of some poor subjects from the tyranny and vassalage which they lived under, in respect of their tithes, exacted with all cruelty and injustice by those whom they call “the lords of new erection.” Which plot so laid, there wanted nothing but some popular occasion for raising of a tumult first, a rebellion afterwards: and this occasion they conceived they had happily gained, by sending the new Liturgy thither; though ordered by their own clergy first, as our author tells us, at the assembly of Aberdeen, *anno* 1616; and after at Perth, *anno* 1618, and fashioned for the most part by their own bishops also. But of this there hath so much been said between the Observator and his antagonist, that there is nothing necessary to be added to it. Thirdly. There was no such matter as the “passing of an Act of Revocation, for the restoring of such lands as had been alienated from the Crown, in the minority of the king’s predecessors,” of which he tells us, Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 398. The king, indeed, did once intend the passing of such an Act; but, finding what an insurrection was likely to ensue upon it, he followed the safer counsel of sir Archibald Acheson, by whom he was advised to sue them in his Courts of Justice. Which course, succeeding to his wish, so terrified many of those great persons who had little else but such lands to maintain their dignities, that they never thought themselves secure as long as the king was in a condition to demand his own. Fourthly. Though it be true enough, that “some persons of honour had been denied such higher titles as they had desired;” (*Idem*, p. 399;) yet was it not the denying of such titles unto *men of honour* which wrought these terrible effects; but the denying of an honorary title to a *man of no honour*. If colonel Alexander Lesley, an obscure fellow, but made rich by the spoils and

plunder of Germany, had been made a baron when he first desired it, the rest of the malcontents in Scotland might have had an heart, though they had no head. But the king, not willing to dishonour so high a title, by conferring it on so low a person, denied the favour; which put the man into such a heat that presently he joined himself to the faction there, drove on the plot, and finally undertook the command of their armies. Rewarded for which notable service with the title of earl of Levin by the king himself, he could not so digest the injury of the first refusal but that he afterwards headed their rebellions upon all occasions.

FULLER.—Little opposition against, some variation from, and more addition unto, what I have written, is herein contained; which if tending to the reader's clearer information, I am right glad thereof, and wish him all happiness therein. Our author proceeds:—

263. DR. HEYLIN.—“Generally they excused the king in their writings, as innocent therein; but charged archbishop Laud as the principal and Dr. Cosin for the instrumental compiler thereof.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 400.) This is no more than we had reason to expect from a former passage, where our author telleth us, that the Scottish bishops withdrew themselves from their obedience to the see of York, in the time when George Nevill was archbishop. And then he adds, “Henceforwards no archbishop of York meddled more with church-matters in Scotland; and happy had it been if no archbishop of Canterbury had since interested himself therein!” (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 523.) His stomach is so full of choler against this poor prelate, that he must needs bring up some of it above an hundred years before he was born.

FULLER.—What could more calmly be written? Perchance some cold phlegm, but nothing of choler, is in the expression. I say again, “It had been happy for king, queen, royal issue, church, state, the archbishop himself, Animadvertor, author, reader, all England.”

264. DR. HEYLIN.—Hence it is, that he rakes together all reports which make against him, and sets them down in rank and file in the course of this History. If archbishop Abbot be suspended from his jurisdiction, the blame thereof was laid on archbishop Laud, “as if, not content to succeed, he endeavoured to supplant him.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 350.) The king sets out a Declaration about lawful Sports; “the reviving and enlarging of which” must be put upon his account also, “some strong presumptions being urged for the proof thereof.” (*Idem*, p. 377.) The reduction of the church to her ancient rules and public doctrines must be nothing else, but “the enjoining of his own private practices and opinions upon other men.” (*Idem*, p. 349.)

And if a Liturgy be composed for the use of the Church of Scotland, who but he must be charged to be the compiler of it?

FULLER.—If all the places here cited are passed already, they have received their several answers; if any of them be to come, they shall receive them (God willing). in due time; that so for the present we may be silent, to prevent repetition.

265, 266. DR. HEYLIN.—But what proofs have we for all this? Only the malice of his enemies, or our author's own disaffection to him, or some common fame. And if it once be made a fame, it shall pass for truth; and, as a truth, find place in our author's History, though the greatest falsehood. *Tam facilis in mendaciis fides, ut, quicquid famæ liceat fingere, illi esset libenter audire*, in my author's\* language. But for the last he brings some proof, (he would have us think so at the least,) that is to say, the words of one Baillie, a Scot, whom it concerned to make him as odious as he could, the better to comply with a pamphlet, called, "The Intentions of the Army;" in which it was declared, that the Scots entered England with a purpose to remove the archbishop from the king, and execute their vengeance on him. What hand Dr. Cosin had in assisting of the work, I am not able to say. But sure I am, that there was nothing done in it by the bishops of England, but with the counsel and co-operation of their brethren in the church of Scotland; namely, the archbishop of St. Andrew's, the archbishop of Glasgow, the bishops of Murray, Ross, Brechin, and Dunblane; as appears by the book, entituled, "Hidden Works of Darkness," &c. fol. 150, 153, 154, &c. And this our author must needs know, (but that he hath a mind to quarrel the archbishop upon every turn,) as appears plainly, 1. By his narrative of the design in king James's time, from the first undertaking of it by the archbishop of St. Andrew's, and the bishop of Galloway then being; whose book, corrected by that king, with some "additions, expunctions, and accommodations," was sent back to Scotland. 2. By that unsatisfiedness which he seems to have, when the project was resumed by king Charles,—Whether the book by him sent into Scotland were the same which had passed the hands of king James, or not; which he expresseth in these words: namely, "In the reign of king Charles, the project was resumed; but whether the same book, or no, God knoweth." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 395.) If so, if "God only know whether it were the same or no," how dares he tell us that it was not? And if it was the same, (as it may be for aught he knoweth,) with what conscience can he charge the making of it upon bishop Laud? Besides, (as afterward he telleth us,) "The church of Scotland claimed not only to be independent, and free as any church in Christendom; a sister, not a daughter of England." (Ch. Hist. vol.

iii. p. 399.) And consequently the prelates of that church had more reason to decline the receiving of a Liturgy imposed on them, or commended to them by the primate of England, (for fear of acknowledging any subordination to him,) than to receive the same Liturgy here by law established, which they might very safely borrow from their sister church without any such danger. But, howsoever it was, the blame must fall on him who did least deserve it.

FULLER.—I will return to my words, which gave the Animadvertor the first occasion of this long discourse :—"Generally they excused the king in their writings, but charged archbishop Laud."

I do not charge the archbishop for compiling the book, but say, the Scots did. Nor do I say, that what they charged on him is true ; but it is true, that they did charge it on him. Had I denied it, I had been a liar ; and seeing I affirmed no more, the Animadvertor is a caviller.

It is observable, that when our chroniclers relate how queen Anne Bolleyn was charged for incontineny ; Margaret countess of Salisbury, for treasonable compliance with the pope ; Henry earl of Surrey, for assuming the arms of England ; Edward duke of Somerset, for designing the death of some Privy Counsellors ; Thomas duke of Norfolk, for aspiring, by the match of the queen of Scots, to the English Crown ; Robert earl of Essex, for dangerous machinations against the person of queen Elizabeth ; Thomas earl of Strafford, for endeavouring to subject England and Ireland to the king's arbitrary power :—that the historians, who barely report these persons thus charged, are not bound to make the charge good ; it is enough if they name their respective accusers, as here I have named the Scots.

It is also observable, that some of the persons aforesaid, though condemned and executed, have since found such favour (or justice rather) with impartial posterity, that, though they could not revive their persons, they have restored their memories to their innocence. And if the like shall be the hap of this archbishop, I shall rejoice therein : I mean, if the Animadvertor's defence of him seems so clear, as to outshine the evidence ; so weighty, as to outpoise all allegations, which in printed books are published against him.

In testimony whereof, I return nothing in contradiction to what the Animadvertor hath written ; and it is questionable, whether my desire that he may—or distrust that he will not—be believed, be the greater. Whatever the success be, I forbear farther rejoinder.

To fight with a shadow, (whether one's own or another's,) passeth for the proverbial expression of a vain and useless act. But, seeing the dead are sometimes termed "shadows," *umbræ* ; to fall foul on them, without absolute necessity, is an act, not only vain, but

wicked ; not only useless, but uncharitable. And therefore no more hereof. Our author proceedeth :—

267. DR. HEYLIN.—“ Thus none, seeing now foul weather in Scotland, could expect it fair sunshine in England.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 404.) In this I am as little of our author’s opinion, as in most things else. The sun in England might have shined with a brighter beam, if the clouds which had been gathered together, and threatened such foul weather in Scotland, had been dispersed and scattered by the thunder of our English ordnance. The opportunity was well given, and well taken also, had it not been unhappily lost in the prosecution.

FULLER.—Grant “ the thunder of our English ordnance ” had scattered the Scottish clouds ; yet, by the confession of the Animadvertor, there must first be “ foul weather in England,” before there could be such fair weather to follow it. The skies are always dark and lowering, even whilst the thunder is engendering therein. Military preparations (in order to a conquest of the Scots) must needs give our nation great troubles, and (for the time) un-sunshine England ; which is enough to secure my expression from just exception.

DR. HEYLIN.—The Scots were then weak, unprovided of all necessities, not above three thousand complete arms to be found amongst them : the English, on the other side, making a formidable appearance, gallantly horsed, completely armed, and intermingled with the choicest of the nobility and gentry in all the nation.

FULLER.—I am much of the mind of the Animadvertor, that there was a visible disparity betwixt the two armies ; and the odds, in the eye of flesh, on the side of the English. They were gallantly horsed indeed, whether in reference to their horses or riders ; and the king pleasantly said, “ It would make the Scots fight against them, were it but to get their brave clothes.” Indeed, the strength of the Scots consisted in their reputation to be strong ; (reported here by such as friended them ;) and the Scotch lion was not half so fierce as he was painted unto us. On the other side, the greatest disadvantage to the English was their own injurious modesty, observed always to over-prize strangers above themselves ; being ignorant of their own strength and valour in war, because they had been so long accustomed to peace. In all this paragraph the Animadvertor and the author may go abreast in their judgments ; and, to prevent quarrels, the Animadvertor shall have the right hand, that they do not juggle one the other.

DR. HEYLIN.—And had the Scots been once broken, and their country wasted, (which had been the easiest thing in the world, for the English army,) &c.

FULLER.—This is consonant to what he hath written of the same subject, in the “Short View of the Life and Reign of King Charles,” \* that the king set forth against the Scots, “accompanied with such an army of lords and gentlemen as might assure him of a cheap and easy victory.” His majesty, I am sure, had, as it became a good Christian, a more modest and moderate apprehension of his own army, such as might give him pregnant hopes, but no assurance, of victory. I never heard of an assurance-office for the success of battles.

But all this is written by the Animadvertor like an Historian, but not like a Doctor in Divinity. This mindeth me of a passage of king Henry II. ; who, standing on the cliffs about St. David’s, in Wales, and there viewing Ireland : “I with my ships am able,” saith he, “to make a bridge over it, if it be no further :” which speech of his being related to Murchard king of Leinster, in Ireland, he demanded if he added not to his speech, “*With the grace of God.*” When it was answered, that he made no mention of God, “Then,” said he more cheerfully, “I fear him the less, which trusteth more to himself than to the help of God.” †

When the Animadvertor tells us, that it had been the “easiest thing in the world for the English to have broken the Scots’ army,” I must tell him, here was one thing in the world easier ; namely, the inserting of these words, “By God’s ordinary blessing,” or something to that purpose. Otherwise, we know who it was that said, that “the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favours to men of skill : time and chance happeneth to them all,” Eccles. ix. 11.

Time was when the Animadvertor did needlessly lavish a GONBLESS : “God bless, not only our Historian, but Baronius himself, from being held an author of no credit.” ‡ He that then spent it when he should have spared it, spares it now when he should have spent it.

DR. HEYLIN.—And their country wasted, they had been utterly disabled from creating trouble to their king, disturbances in their own church, and destruction to England. So true is that of the wise historian : *Conatus subditorum irritos imperia semper promovère* ; “The insurrections of the people, when they are suppressed, do always make the king stronger, and the subjects weaker.”

FULLER.—All this proceeds (as the former) on the supposition,

\* Page 74.

† CAMDEN’S “Remains,” page 250.

‡ In these his

“Animadversions,” (as by him set forth,) page 8. (See page 363 of this volume.)

that the English had beaten the Scots ; which, though (in the eye of flesh) probable, was uncertain. The Latins and English have the same word, *momentum*, “moment,” which signifieth, as “time of the least continuance,” so “matters of most concernment,” to show that the scales of success, which God alone holds in his hand, are so ticklish, that *the mote of a moment* may turn them on either side ; which is the reason why no man can positively conclude of future contingencies.

268. DR. HEYLIN.—“The sermon ended, we chose Dr. Stewart, dean of Chichester, Prolocutor ; and, the next day of sitting, we met at Westminster, in the chapel of king Henry VII.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 405.) Had it not been for these and some other passages of this nature, our author might have lost the honour of being taken notice of for one of the Clerks of the Convocation ; and one, not of the lowest form, but passing for some of those wise men who began to be fearful of themselves, and to be jealous of that power by which they were enabled to make new Canons. How so ? Because it was feared by the judicious, (himself still for one,) “lest the Convocation, whose power of meddling with church-matters had been bridled up for many years before, should, now enabled with such power, over-act their parts, especially in such dangerous and discontented times,” as it after followeth. Wisely foreseen ! But then why did not we, that is to say, our author, and the rest of those wise and judicious persons, forewarn their weak and unadvised brethren of the present danger ? Or rather, why did they go along with the rest for company, and follow “those who had before outrun the Canons, by their additional conformity ?”

FULLER.—Dear “honour,” indeed ; *honor onus* ! for which I was fined, with the rest of my brethren, two hundred pounds, by the House of Commons, though not put to pay it ; partly, because it never passed the House of Lords ; partly, because they thought it needless to shave *their* hair *whose* heads they meant to cut off : I mean, they were so charitable as not to make *them* pay a fine *whose* place in cathedrals they intended not long after to take away.

I insert the word we, not to credit myself, but to confirm the reader ; relations from an eye- and ear-witness meeting with the best belief. Such insinuations, of the writer *being present at the actions he writeth of*, want not precedents in holy and profane authors. Hence it is collected, that St. Luke accompanied St. Paul in his dangerous voyage to Rome : “We were all in the ship two hundred threescore and sixteen souls,” Acts xxvii. 37.

Let the Animadvertor lay what load he pleaseth on me, whose back is broad and big enough to bear it. But O let him spare my worthy friends ! some now glorious saints in heaven, bishop West-



field, Dr. Holdsworth ; and some of the highest repute still alive, whom I forbear to name. It comforteth me not a little, that “ God hath chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise.”

DR. HEYLIN.—How wise the rest were, I am not able to say. But certainly our author showed himself “ no wiser than Waltham’s calf, who ran nine miles to suck a bull, and came home athirst,” as the proverb saith. His running unto Oxford, which cost him as much in seventeen weeks, as he had spent in Cambridge in seventeen years, was but a second sally to the first knight-errantry.

FULLER.—I can patiently comport with the Animadvertor’s *jeers* ; which I behold as so many frogs, that it is pretty and pleasing to see them hop and skip about, having not much harm in them. But I cannot abide his *railings* ; which are like to toads, swelling with venom within them. Any one may rail who is bred but in Billingsgate-College : and I am sorry to hear such language from the Animadvertor, a Doctor in Divinity ; seeing railing is as much *beneath* a Doctor, as against Divinity.

When Dr. Turner, a physician sufficiently known, gave the lie (at the earl of Pembroke’s table) to the earl of Carnarvon : “ I will take the lie from you ;” replied the earl, “ but I will never take physic from you.” If such railing be consistent with the Doctor’s Divinity, this once I will take *the calf*, but never learn Divinity from him.

Two things comfort me under his reviling. First. That no worse man than David himself complained, that he became “ a PROVERB to his enemies,” Psalm lxix. 2. Secondly. Though a *calf* be a contemptible creature, passing for the emblem, not (with the dove) of simplicity, but of plain silliness ; yet is it a clean one, and accepted of God for sacrifice, Heb. ix. 19. Whereas the snarling dog (though a creature of far more cunning and sagacity) was so odious and unclean, that by a peculiar law it was provided, that “ the price of a dog should not be brought into the house of God,” Deut. xxiii. 18. Our author thus proceedeth :—

269, 270. DR. HEYLIN.—“ Next day the Convocation came together, &c. when, contrary to the general expectation, it was mentioned to improve the present opportunity in perfecting the new Canons which they had begun.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 406.) I have not heard of any such motion as our author speaks of, from any who were present at that time, though I have diligently laboured to inform myself in it. Nor is it probable, that any such motion should be made, as the case then stood. The Parliament had been dissolved on Tuesday the 5th of May ; the clergy met in Convocation on the morrow after,

expecting then to be dissolved, and licensed to go home again. But, "contrary to that general expectation," instead of hearing some news of his majesty's writ for their dissolution, there came an order from the archbishop to the Prolocutor, to adjourn till Saturday. And this was all the business which was done that day; the clergy generally being in no small amazement, when they were required not to dissolve till further order. Saturday being come, what then? "A new commission," saith he, "was brought from his majesty; by virtue whereof we were warranted still to sit, not in the capacity of a Convocation, but of a Synod." I had thought our author, with his "wise and judicious friends," had better hearkened to the tenor of that Commission, than to come out with such a gross and wild absurdity, as this is, so fit for none as sir Edward Deering; and for him only to make sport with in the House of Commons. At the beginning of the Convocation, when the Prolocutor was admitted, the archbishop produced his majesty's commission under the Great Seal; whereby the clergy were enabled to consult, treat of, and conclude such Canons, as they conceived most expedient to the peace of the church, and his majesty's service. But this commission being to expire with the end of the Parliament; it became void, of no effect, as soon as the Parliament was dissolved. Which being made known unto the king, who was resolved the Convocation should continue, and that the clergy should go on in completing those Canons which they had so happily begun; he caused a new commission to be sent unto them, in the same words, and to the very same effect, as the other was; but that it was to continue *durante beneplacito* only, as the other was not.

FULLER.—The reader may take notice, that there is some difference in judgment betwixt the Animadvertor and me; and no wonder then if some (no great, I hope) variations betwixt us, in relating the passages of this Convocation, each of us observing what made most for his own interest. The reader also may be pleased to use his own discretion, and to credit him whom he believeth most probable of the two, exactly to observe, firmly to remember, and faithfully to relate, what we saw done, (both of us being there,) and since borrowing help of our friends, then present, where we fall short in our intelligence.

271. DR. HEYLIN.—It follows next, that "Dr. Brownrigg, Dr. Hacket, Dr. Holdsworth, &c. with others, to the number of thirty-six, earnestly protested against the continuance of the Convocation." (*Ibid.*) It is possible enough that Dr. Brownrigg, now lord bishop of Exeter, Dr. Hacket, and the rest of the thirty-six, our author being of the quorum, (in his own understanding of the word,) might be unsatisfied in the continuance of the Convocation, because of some offence, which, as they conceived, would be taken at it. But if they had protested, and protested earnestly, as our author tells us, the noise of so many votes concurring must needs be heard by all the rest which

were then assembled ; from none of which I can learn any thing of this protestation.

FULLER.—I am nothing moved with his jeer, when he calleth me of the quorum in this Convocation. Mithridates king of Pontus is commonly reported so habited to the eating of poison, that that which was nauseous and noxious at the first, by custom became harmless unto him. I am so used to the bitter jeers of the Animadvertor, so frequently laid in my dish, that now they are become food, not physic, unto me; and the greatest quantity of them will not so much as stir my constitution to anger.

It seemeth strange to me indeed, that the protest of the dissenters was not heard by the rest in the Convocation ; I cannot be so uncharitable, to think them in this point like those of whom the apostle speaketh, *Λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τῆτο δέλοντας*, “This they are wilfully ignorant of,” 2 Peter iii. 5. I impute it rather to their forgetfulness; most of them surviving being aged persons, and this done more than sixteen years since. For though it be true, *Omnia quæ curant senes meminervnt* ; yet were they more prone to oblivion in this particular, because “they cared not for” that protestation they disliked ; and therefore never charged it on their memories.

The best is, I may speak (I hope as yet) of the thirty-six dissenters, in the same language of the apostle: “Of whom the greater part remain until this present, but some are fallen asleep,” 1 Cor. xv. 6. Bishop Brownrigg, Dr. Hacket, Dr. Warmestry, &c. are still (and may they long be) alive, who will be believed in this point, that they protested against the sitting of the Convocation, after the dissolution of the Parliament.

DR. HEYLIN.—Or if they did protest so earnestly, as he says they did, why was not the protestation reduced into writing, subscribed with their hands in due form of law, and so delivered to the register to remain upon record, (amongst the other Acts of that House,) for their indemnity : which not being done, rendereth this protest of theirs (if any such protest there were) to signify nothing, but their dislike of the continuance.

FULLER.—Herein the Animadvertor doth speak a sad truth ; the dissenters were ill-advised herein, whereby their protest (significant only in their own consciences) was legally rendered of none effect.

But herein they may partly be excused, because they (though not entering a written protest) supposed a verbal one would manifest their dislike, and hoped it would sufficiently secure them from a danger, which (though suspected) was not certain to ensue.

This afterwards was very eagerly urged against them, by a Com-

mittee in Parliament ; and sorry I am that they could not make their answer as clear as the objection.

272, 273. DR. HEYLIN.—But whereas our author tells us, that “the whole House consisted but of six-score persons,” it may be thought that he diminisheth the number of set purpose, to make his own party seem the greater. For, in the lower House of Convocation for the province of Canterbury, if all parties summoned do appear, there are no fewer than two-and-twenty deans, four-and-twenty prebendaries, fifty-four archdeacons, and forty-four clerks, representing the diocesan clergy, amounting in the total to an hundred forty-four persons ; whereof the thirty-six protestors (if so many there were) make the fourth part only. Howsoever, all parties being not well satisfied with the lawfulness of their continuance, his majesty was advertised of it ; who, upon conference with his Judges and Counsel learned in the laws, caused a short writing to be drawn, and subscribed by their several hands, in these following words ; namely, “At Whitehall, May 10th, 1640 : The Convocation, being called by the king’s writ, is to continue till it be dissolved by the king’s writ, notwithstanding the dissolving of the Parliament.” Subscribed by FINCH Lord-Keeper, MANCHESTER Lord Privy Seal, LITTLETON Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, BANKS Attorney-General, WHITFIELD and HEATH, his majesty’s Serjeants.

FULLER.—I protest, and now will enter my protestation, *in scriptis*, (that it may be valid,) I had no design either to subtract from-the number in the Convocation, or add to those of the dissenters.

I believe the Animadvertor is very right in his arithmetic of persons, in the provincial Convocation of Canterbury.

But concerning the archdeacons, give me leave once to enlarge myself, in stating their true number, because it is hard to find either a printed or written catalogue of them, which is exact herein. They are generally reckoned up but fifty-two, as followeth :—

The two first [columns] containing eighteen a-piece, the last, sixteen ; which are but fifty-two in my arithmetic.\*

[BISHOPRIC OF] ST. ASAPH : [Archdeaconry of] St. Asaph.—  
BANGOR : Bangor, Anglesey, Merioneth.—BRISTOL : Dorset.—  
BATH AND WELLS : Wells, Bath, Taunton.—CANTERBURY :  
Canterbury.—CHICHESTER : Chichester, Lewes.—COVENTRY  
AND LICHFIELD : Stafford, Derby, Coventry, Salop.—ELY : Ely.  
—EXETER : Exeter, Cornwall, Totness, Barnstaple.—GLOUCESTER :  
Gloucester.—HEREFORD : Hereford, Salop.—LONDON :  
London, Middlesex, Essex, Colchester, St. Albans.—LINCOLN :

\* \* This small paragraph refers to the three columns in which this list of Archdeaconries was printed in the folio edition.—EDIT.

Lincoln, Stow, Bedford, Buckingham, Huntingdon, Leicester.—  
**LANDAFF** : Landaff.—**ST. DAVID'S** : St. David's, Caermarthen,  
 Cardigan, Brecknock.—**NORWICH** : Norwich, Norfolk, Suffolk,  
 Sudbury.—**OXFORD** : Oxford.—**PETERBOROUGH** : Northampton.  
 —**ROCHESTER** : Rochester.—**SALISBURY** : Wilts, Berks, Sarum.  
 —**WINCHESTER** : Winchester, Surrey.—**WORCESTER** : Wor-  
 cester.

This is the best printed list I have ever seen, presented in  
**WEAVER'S** "Funeral Monuments," (page 886, &c.) having the  
 valuation of each archdeaconry annexed ; taken, as he saith, (and I  
 believe him therein,) out of sir Robert Cotton's library ; and yet I  
 am sure it is not complete.

Wherefore I supply Warwick, (in the diocess of Worcester,) as  
 I find it in a more perfect written catalogue. And yet still one is  
 wanting, even Westminster, whose church was advanced to the see  
 of a bishop by king Henry VIII. ; and though since it hath been  
 set back from a cathedral to a collegiate-church ; yet it still retain-  
 eth the honour to send one of their prebendaries (by the title of  
 their *archdeacon*) to the Convocation. And thus we have our full  
 number of fifty-four.

But whereas the Animadvertor taxeth me for saying, "The Con-  
 vocation consisted of six-score :" I confess, when I first read his  
 words, I had not a "Church-History" by me, to confute it. Yet  
 I conceived such positiveness in a number improbable to fall from  
 my pen, who had learned this lesson from the best of teachers, (the  
 Spirit of God,) not to be peremptory, but to leave a latitude in  
 numbers of this nature.

**IN TIMES** :—"Darius being about threescore and two years  
 old," Dan. v. 31. "Jesus began to be about thirty years of age,"  
 Luke iii. 23.

**IN PLACES** :—"From Jerusalem about sixty furlongs," Luke  
 xxiv. 13. "Had rowed about five-and-twenty or thirty furlongs,"  
 John vi. 19.

**IN PERSONS** :—"About six hundred thousand men on foot,"  
 Exod. xii. 37. "Added to the church about three thousand souls,"  
 Acts ii. 41.

But upon inspection of my book, my words were : "The whole  
 House consisting of *about six-score* ;" where "about" is receptive  
 of *more or less*. Besides, the Convocation, as to the effectual  
 managing of matters, properly consisted not of the members belong-  
 ing thereto, but present therein ; and some five-score and ten was  
 the general and constant appearance ; the rest being absent for age,  
 sickness, and other detentions.

**DR. HEYLIN**.—Which writing, ("an instrument" our author calls

it,) being communicated to the clergy by the lord archbishop on the morrow after, did so compose the minds of all men, that they went forwards very cheerfully with the work in hand: the principal of those whom our author calls Dissenters bringing in the Canon of preaching for conformity, (being the eighth Canon in the book, as now they are placed,) which was received and allowed of, as it came from his hand without alteration.

FULLER.—And calleth it “an instrument” properly enough both to the original notation, and modern acceptation of the word. Instrument is so termed *ab instruendo*, “from instructing.” This writing did first instruct us at the present, that, by the judgment of those great statesmen and lawyers, we might legally continue, notwithstanding the dissolution of the Parliament. And, since, this writing hath (by the event thereof) *instructed* us, that, seeing the judgments of the grandees in the law were censured erroneous in Parliament, it is unsafe in matters of this nature to rely on the opinions of any (comparatively) private persons.

As for the modern acceptation of the word, I appeal to the critics in language, whether this writing (as the Animadvertor is fain to term it) of the Judges may not be called by the general name of “instrument,” harmoniously enough to the propriety thereof.

274. DR. HEYLIN.—Howsoever, our author keeps himself to his former folly, shutting up his extravagancy with this conclusion: “Thus was an old Convocation converted into a new Synod.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 407.) An expression borrowed from the speech of a “witty gentleman,” as he is called by the author of “the History of the Reign of King Charles,” and since by him declared to be the lord George Digby, now earl of Bristol. But he that spent most of his wit upon it, and thereby gave occasion unto others for the like mistakings, was sir Edward Deering, in a speech made against these Canons, *anno* 1640; where we find these flourishes: “Would you confute the Convocation? They were a holy Synod. Would you argue against the Synod? Why, they were Commissioners. Would you dispute the Commission? They will mingle all powers together, and answer, that they were some fourth thing, that neither we know nor imagine; that is to say,” (as it follows afterwards, page 27,) “a convocational-synodical Assembly of Commissioners.” \* More of this fine stuff we may see hereafter. In the mean time we may judge, by this remnant, of the whole piece; and find it upon proof to be very slight, and not worth the wearing. For, First, the gentleman could not, and our author cannot, choose but know, that a Convocation and a Synod (as used in England of late times) are but the same one thing under divers names, the one borrowed from a Grecian—the other from a Latin—original; the Convocation of the clergy of the province of

\* “Collection of Speeches,” p. 26.

Canterbury being nothing but a Provincial Synod; as a National Synod is nothing else but the Convocation of the clergy of both provinces. Secondly. Our author knows by this time, that the Commission, which seems to make this doughty difference, changed not the Convocation into a Synod, (as some vainly think,) but only made that Convocation active in order to the making of Canons, which otherwise had been able to proceed no further than the grant of subsidies. Thirdly. That nothing is more ordinary than for the Convocations of all times since the Reformation to take unto themselves the name of Synods. For, "the Articles of Religion," made in the Convocation anno 1552, are called, in the title of the book, *Articuli de quibus in Synodo Londinensi convenit, &c.* The same name given to those agreed on in the Convocation, anno 1562, as appears by the title of that book also, in the Latin edition. The Canons of the year 1571 are said to be concluded and agreed upon in *Synodo inchoatâ Lond. in æde Divi Pauli, &c.* In the year 1575 came out a Book of Articles, with this title following; namely, "Articles whereupon it was agreed by the most reverend Father in God the Archbishop of Canterbury, and other the Bishops, and the whole Clergy in the Province of Canterbury, in the Convocation or Synod holden at Westminster." The like we find in the year 1597, (being the last active Convocation in queen Elizabeth's time,) in which we meet with a book entituled, *Constitutiones Ecclesiasticæ, &c. in Synodo inchoatâ Londini vicesimo quinto Die Mensis Octobris.*

FULLER.—I request the reader would be pleased to call to his remembrance a passage of the Animadvertor's, on my fifth book, relating to the reign of king Henry VIII. :—

"I must confess myself to be at a loss in this intricate labyrinth, unless, perhaps, there were some critical difference in those elder times between a Synod and a Convocation; the first being called by the archbishops in their several and respective provinces, as the necessities of the church—the other only by the king, as his occasions and affairs—did require the same." \*

I find myself now in the like labyrinth, and can meet with no Ariadne's thread to extricate myself. I confess, commonly, Convocation and Synod pass for synonymes, signifying one and the same thing; yet some make this nice difference:—

1. *Convocation*, which is, in the beginning and ending, parallel with the Parliament.

2. *Synod*, which is called by the king out of Parliament.

I acknowledge myself a seeker in this point, and will not wilfully bolt mine eyes against the beams of truth, by whomsoever delivered. Meantime, I crave leave to enter this my dissatisfaction herein, seeing the Animadvertor so lately did confess his in a thing of the like nature.

\* See page 467 of this volume.—EDIT.



DR. HEYLIN.—Our author, finally, is to know, that though the members of the two Convocations of York and Canterbury did not meet in person, yet they communicated their counsels, the results of the one being dispatched unto the other, and there agreed on or rejected, as they saw cause for it.

FULLER.—I am not to know it, for I knew it before, and nothing in my book appears to the contrary, that the two provincial Synods privately did communicate their transactions, as they were *in fieri*, “in the making;” and at last publicly, namely, when we at Westminster had completed the Canons, by our subscription thereunto.

DR. HEYLIN.—Which, laid together, shows the vanity of another passage in the speech of sir Edward Deering, where he vapoureth thus; namely, “A strange Commission, wherein no one Commissioner’s name is to be found; a strange Convocation, that lived when the Parliament was dead; a strange holy Synod, where one part never saw, never conferred with the other.” Lastly. Sir Edward Deering seems to marvel at the title of the Book of Canons then in question, expressing, that “they were treated upon in Convocation, agreed upon in Synod.” “And this,” saith he, “is a new mould to cast Canons in, never used before.” But had he looked upon the title of the Book of Canons, *anno* 1603, he had found it otherwise. The title this: namely, “Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, treated by the Bishop of London, President of the Convocation for the Province of Canterbury, &c. and agreed upon with the King’s Majesty’s Licence in their Synod begun at London, *anno* 1603.” And so much for the satisfaction of all such persons, whom either that gentleman, or this our author, has misinformed, and consequently abused in this particular.

FULLER.—He hath now vapoured out that, which by the apostle is termed even “a vapour which appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away,” James iv. 4. Being dead, the Animadvertor might have spared this expression upon him.

I believe neither he nor the author did wittingly or willingly misinform any, and therefore cannot by any charitable pen be justly condemned for abusing them. Our author proceeds:—

275. DR. HEYLIN.—“Now because great bodies move slowly, &c. it was thought fit to contract the Synod into a select Committee of some twenty-six, beside the Prolocutor.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 407.) No such contracting of the Synod as our author speaks of. There was indeed a Committee of twenty-six, or thereabouts, appointed to consider of a Canon for uniformity in some rites and ceremonies; of which number were the principal of those whom he calls Dissenters, and our author too amongst the rest; who having agreed upon the Canon, it was by them presented to the rest of the clergy in Convocation, and by them approved. And possible it is, that the drawing-up of some

other Canons might be referred also to that Committee, (as is accustomed in such cases,) without contracting the whole House into that small body, or excluding any man from being present at their consultation.

FULLER.—I know not what offence the word “contracting” may give; but my meaning, obvious to any reader, is this,—that a select Committee was appointed, to prepare matters of greatest importance; no member being excluded from being present at, but from giving a vote in, that consultation.

276. DR. HEYLIN.—But whereas our author afterwards tells us, that “nothing should be accounted the act of the House till thrice (*as he takes it*) publicly voted therein.” (*Idem, ibid.*) It is but as he *takes it*, or *mistakes it*, rather; and so let it go.

FULLER.—He might have allowed me the liberty of that modest parenthesis, [“as I take it,”] without carping at it. Some things, I confess, (having since better informed myself,) passed at the first time; but others which were merely new were thrice read, on the same token that it occasioned the contest betwixt the Prolocutor and Dr. Holdsworth.

277. DR. HEYLIN.—But I needed not to have signified, that our author was one of this Committee, he will tell it himself; and he will tell us more than that, publishing himself for one of the thirty-six Dissenters, the better to ingratiate himself with the rising side. “The next day,” (so he lets us know,) “we all subscribed the Canons; suffering ourselves (according to the order of such meetings) to be all concluded by the majority of votes, though some of us in the Committee privately dissented in the passing of many particulars.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 409.) - So then our author was content to play the good-fellow at the last, and go along hand in hand with the rest of his company; dissenting privately, but consenting publicly, which is as much as can be looked for.

FULLER.—It is not worth the while for him who is falling into the grave to endeavour to ingratiate himself with any “rising side.” I appeal to the Animadvertor’s own conscience, if I have not written the plain truth herein. Our author proceeds:—

278. DR. HEYLIN.—“No sooner came these Canons abroad into a public view, but various were men’s censures upon them.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 409.) Not possible that, in such a confusion both of affections and opinions, it should otherwise be. *Non omnibus una voluntas*, was a note of old, and will hold true as long as “there are many men to have many minds.” And yet, if my information deceive me not, these Canons found great approbation from the mouths of some, from whom it had been least expected; particularly from Justice

Crook, whose argument in the case of Ship-money was printed afterwards by the Order of the House of Commons. Of whom I have been told, by a person of great worth and credit, that, having read over the Book of Canons, when it first came out, he lifted up his hands, and gave hearty thanks to Almighty God, that he had lived to see such good effects of a Convocation. It was very well that they pleased him; but that they should please all men, was not to be hoped for.

FULLER.—This is all additory, nothing at all opposite, to what I have written; so we may proceed. Our author proceeds:—

279. DR. HEYLIN.—“Many took exception at the hollowness of the oath in the middle thereof, having its bowels puffed up with a windy *et cetera*, a *cheveril* word, which might be stretched as men would measure it.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 410.) Of this *et cetera*, which has made so much noise in the world, I shall now say nothing. Somewhat is here subjoined by our author in excuse thereof, the rest made up by the Observator. Only I shall make bold to ask him, why he observed not this *et cetera* when the oath was first under consideration? or why he signified not his dissent when it came to the vote, and showed some reasons which might move him to object against it? It had been fitter for “a wise and judicious man” to signify his dislike of any thing when it might be mended, than to join with others in condemning it when it was past remedy.

FULLER.—I was not sensible of any just cause of exception therein. The Animadvertor confesseth, that I have subjoined “somewhat” in the excuse thereof. And let me add, that that “somewhat” is as much to purpose in defence of that oath, (being borrowed from as learned and pious a pen as England then enjoyed,) as any thing that the Animadvertor or his party can allege. Wherefore, except “joining with those who do defend it” be the same with “joining with those who do condemn it,” the Animadvertor hath unjustly ranked me amongst the latter.

280. DR. HEYLIN.—But, *mala mens, malus animus*, as the saying is. The Convocation had no ill intent in it when they passed it so; though some few, out of their perverseness and corrupt affections, were willing to put their own sense on it, and spoil an honest-meaning text with a factious gloss. But let us follow our author as he leads the way, and we shall find, that

“Some bishops were very forward in pressing this oath, even before the time thereof. For, whereas a liberty was allowed to all to deliberate thereon, until the Feast of Michael the Archangel, some presently pressed the ministers of their diocesses for the taking thereof.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 411.) It seems by this, that our author was so far from taking notice of any thing done in the Convocation, when the

Canon for the oath was framed, that he never so much as looked into the Canon itself since the book came out. He had not else dreamed of a liberty of deliberation till the Feast of St. Michael the Archangel, which I am sure the Canon gives not. The Synod did indeed decree, that "all archbishops and bishops, and all other priests and deacons, in places exempt or not exempt, should, before the second day of November next ensuing, take the following oath, against all innovation of doctrine or discipline." \* By which we see, that the oath was to be given and taken before the second of November ; but no such thing as liberty of deliberation till the Feast of St. Michael. And therefore if some bishops did press the clergy of their several and respective diocesses, as soon as they returned home from the Convocation, they might well do it by the Canon, without making any such "essay of their activity, if Providence," as our author most wisely words it, "had not prevented them."

FULLER.—Though there was no solemn order entered or printed, yet am I sure, (having cause to be assured thereof,) such a condescension was agreed on ; and I know who did plead the benefit of such deliberation, on the same token it was denied to him.

281. DR. HEYLIN.—If any of the bishops did require their clergy to take the oath upon their knees, (as he says they did,) though it be more than was directed by the Canon, yet I conceive that no wise man would scruple at it, considering the gravity and greatness of the business which he was about.

FULLER.—The oaths of allegiance and supremacy, being of as high and holy a nature and concernment, are never urged in that posture. All things are disposed of by Divine Providence ; and let the Doctor write against me what he pleaseth ; but take heed how he writes corrective Animadversions on the proceedings of the Greatest and Best of Beings.

282. DR. HEYLIN.—But then, "the exception of exceptions was, because they were generally condemned as illegally passed, to the prejudice of the fundamental liberty of the subject ; whereof we shall hear enough in the next Parliament." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 410.) Not "generally condemned," either "as illegally passed," or as tending to "prejudice of the subjects' rights," I am sure of that. Scarce so much as condemned by any for those respects, but by such whom it concerned (for carrying on of their designs) to weaken the authority of the church, and advance their own. But because our author tells us, that we shall find enough of this in the following Parliament, we are to follow him to that Parliament for our satisfaction : and there we find, that Mr. Maynard made a speech, in the Committee of Lords,

\* Canon vii., 1640.

against the Canons made by the bishops in the last Convocation, "in which he *endeavoured* to prove," &c.

FULLER.—Diogenes being demanded what one should give him to strike on the head as hard as he could; "Give me," said he, "but an helmet." Well fare my helmet, the seasonable interposition of the word "*endeavoured*!" which hath secured me from the blows of the Animadvertor, and perchance his hand thereby retunded. Besides, I have a double helmet; Mr. (now Serjeant) Maynard, no less eminently known for his skill in law, than for his love to the clergy, by pleading so effectually (in his success as well as desire) for their tithes. Wherefore, being weary with this long contest, I resolve for a while even to take my natural rest, and will quietly sleep, until jogged by that which particularly concerneth me.

283—286. DR. HEYLIN.—"Endeavoured to prove, that the clergy had no power to make Canons, without common consent in Parliament, because, in the Saxon times, laws and constitutions ecclesiastical had the confirmation of peers, and sometimes of the people; to which great Councils our Parliaments do succeed." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 424.) Which argument, if it be of force to prove, that the clergy can make no Canons without consent of the peers and people in Parliament; it must prove also, that the peers and people can make no statutes without consent of the clergy in their Convocation. My reason is, because such Councils in the times of the Saxons were mixed assemblies, consisting as well of laics as of ecclesiastics; and the matters there concluded on of a mixed nature also, laws being passed as commonly in them in order to the good governance of the commonwealth, as Canons for the regulating such things as concerned religion. But these great Councils of the Saxons being divided into two parts in the times ensuing, the clergy did their work by themselves, without any confirmation from the king or Parliament, till the submission of the clergy to king Henry VIII. And if the Parliaments did succeed in the place of those great Councils, (as he says they did,) it was because that anciently the Procurators of the clergy, not the bishops only, had their place in Parliament, though neither peers nor people voted in the Convocations. Which being so, it is not much to be admired, "that there was some checking" (as is said in the Second argument) "about the disuse of the general making of such church-laws." But checking or repining at the proceeding of any superior court, makes not the Acts thereof illegal; for, if it did, the Acts of Parliaments themselves would be reputed of no force, or illegally made, because the clergy for a long time have checked (and think they have good cause to check) for their being excluded. Which checking of the Commons appears not only in those ancient authors which the gentleman cited, but in the remonstrance tendered by them to king Henry VIII. exemplified

at large in these Animadversions on the third book of the "Church-History," No. 61.\* But because this, being a record of the Convocation, may not come within the walk of a Common-Lawyer, I shall put him in mind of that memorable passage in the Parliament, 51 Edward III.; which in brief was this: The Commons finding themselves aggrieved, as well with certain constitutions made by the clergy in their Synods, as with some laws or ordinances which were lately passed, more to the advantage of the clergy than the common people, put in a Bill to this effect; namely, "That no Act nor Ordinance should from thenceforth be made or granted on the petition of the said clergy, without the consent of the Commons; and that the said Commons should not be bound, in times to come, by any Constitutions made by the clergy of this realm, for their own advantage, to which the Commons of this realm had not given consent." The reason of which is this, (and it is worth the marking,) *Car eux ne veulent estre obligez a nul de vos Estatuz ne Ordinances faitz sanz leur assent*, "Because the said clergy did not think themselves bound" (as indeed they were not in those times) "by any Statute, Act, or Ordinance, made without their assent in the Court of Parliament." But that which could not be obtained by this checking of the Commons, in the declining and last times of king Edward III. was in some part effected by the more vigorous prosecution of king Henry VIII. who, to satisfy the desires of the Commons in this particular, and repress their checkings, obtained from the clergy, that they should neither make nor execute any Canons without his consent, as before is said; so that the king's power of confirming Canons was grounded on the free and voluntary submission of the clergy, and was not built, as the Third argument objecteth, on so weak a foundation as "the pope's making Canons by his sole power:" the pope not making Canons here, nor putting his Prescripts and letters decretory in the place of Canons, but only as a remedy for some present exigency. So that the king's power in this particular not being built upon the pope's, as he said it was, it may well stand, "that kings may make Canons without consent of Parliament," though he saith they cannot. But whereas it is argued, in the Fourth place, that the clause in the Statute of Submission, in which it is said, that "the clergy shall not make Canons without the king's leave," doth not imply, that by his leave alone they may make them; I cannot think that he delivered this for law, and much less for logic. For, had this been looked on formerly as a piece of law, the Parliaments would have checked at it at some time or other, and been as sensible of the king's encroachments, in executing this power without them, as anciently some of them had been about the disuse of the like general consent in the making of them.

FULLER—*Dormit securus.*

287. DR. HEYLIN.—In the next place our author tells us that,

\* See pages 417—419 of this volume. —EDIT.



“Mr. Maynard endeavoured also to prove, that these Canons were against the king’s prerogative, the rights, liberties, and properties of the subject.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 424.) And he saith well, that it was “endeavoured to be proved,” and *endeavoured* only; nothing amounting to a proof being to be found in that which follows. It had before been voted by the House of Commons, that “the Canons are against the fundamental laws of this realm, against the king’s prerogative, property of the subject, the rights of Parliament, and do tend to faction and sedition.” And it was fit that some *endeavours* should be used to make good the vote. But this, being but a general charge, requires a general answer only; and it shall be this: “Before the Canons were subscribed, they were imparted to the king by the archbishop of Canterbury, and by the king communicated to the Lords of the Council; who, calling to them the assistance of the Judges, and some of the king’s Counsel learned in the laws of this realm, caused the said Canons to be read and considered of, the king being then present. By all which, upon due and mature deliberation, the Canons were approved; and, being so approved, were sent back to the clergy in the Convocation, and by them subscribed.”\* And certainly it had been strange, that they should pass the approbation of the judges and learned lawyers, had they contained any thing “against the fundamental laws of the land, the property of the subject, and the rights of Parliament,” or been approved of by the Lords of his majesty’s Council, had any thing been contained in them “derogatory to the king’s prerogative, or tending to faction and sedition.” So that the foundation being ill laid, the superstructures and objections which are built upon it may be easily shaken and thrown down. To the First therefore it is answered, that nothing hath been more ordinary in all former times, than for the Canons of the church to inflict penalties on such as shall disobey them; exemplified in the late Canons of 1603, many of which extend not only unto excommunication, but even to degradation and irregularity, for which see Canons 38, 113, &c. To the Second, that there is nothing in those Canons which determineth or limiteth the king’s authority, but much that makes for and defendeth the right of the subject, for which the Convocation might rather have expected thanks than censure from ensuing Parliaments. To the Third, that when the Canon did declare the government of kings to be founded on the law of nature, it was not to condemn all other governments as being unlawful, but to commend that of the kings as being the best. Nor can it logically be inferred, that because the kingly government is not received in all places, that therefore it ought not so to be: or that the government (by this Canon) should be the same in all places, and in all alike; because some kings do and may lawfully part with many of their rights for the good of their subjects; which others do and may as lawfully retain unto themselves. To the Fourth, that the doctrine

\* “History of King Charles,” fol. 208.



of non-resistance is built expressly on the words of St. Paul, Rom. xiii. 2; and therefore to condemn the Canon in that behalf, is to condemn the word of God upon which it is founded. Finally, to the Fifth and last, that the statute of 5, 6 Edward VI. declaring, that the days there mentioned shall be kept for holy-days, and no other, relates only to the abolishing of some other festivals, which had been formerly observed in the realm of England, and not to the disabling of the church from ordaining any other holy-days (on emergent causes) in the times to come.

FULLER—*Dormit securus.*

DR. HEYLIN.—Assuredly that able lawyer would have spoken more home unto the point, could the cause have borne it. *Eloquentem facit causæ bonitas*, in the orator's language. And therefore, looking on the heads of the arguments, (as our author represents them to us,) I must needs think, that they were rather fitted to the sense of the House, than they were to his own.

FULLER.—I now begin to awake, and rub my eyes, hearing somewhat wherein I am concerned, as if I had unfaithfully related these arguments.

I confess it is but a breviate of them, accommodated to the proportion of my book; and had they been at large, much lustre must be lost whilst related, seeing none but Mr. Maynard can repeat the arguments of Mr. Maynard to equal advantage. However, I had them from as observant and judicious a person as any in the House of Lords; and if I should name him, the Animadvertor would believe me herein.

DR. HEYLIN.—What influence these arguments might have on the House of Peers, when reported by the bishop of Lincoln, I am not able to affirm. But so far I concur with our author, "that they lost neither life nor lustre," as they came from his mouth, who (as our author says) "was a back-friend to the Canons, because made during his absence and durance in the Tower." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 424.) A piece of ingenuity which I did not look for.

FULLER.—There are some pens that if a man do look for ingenuity from them, he may *look* for it.

288, 289. DR. HEYLIN.—The power of Convocation being thus shaken and endangered, that of the High-Commission and the Bishops' Courts was not like to hold; the one being taken away by Act of Parliament, and the other much weakened in the co-ercive power thereof, by a clause in that Act; of which our author tells us, that

"Mr. Pym triumphed at this success, crying out, *Digitus Dei*, 'It is the finger of God, that the bishops should so supinely suffer themselves' to be surprised in their power." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 425.) And well might Mr. Pym triumph, as having gained the point he

aimed at, in subverting the co-ercive power, and consequently the whole exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. But he had no reason to impute it to "the finger of God," or to the carelessness of the bishops in suffering themselves to be so supinely surprised. For, First, the bishops saw too plainly, that those general words, by which they were disabled from inflicting any pain or penalty, would be extended to suspension, excommunication, and other ecclesiastical censures. But, Secondly, they saw withal that the stream was too strong for them to strive against, most of the Lords being wrought on by the popular party in the House of Commons to pass the Bill. Thirdly. They were not without hope, that, when the Scots' army was disbanded, and that nation satisfied by the king's condescensions to them, there might be such an explication made of those general words, as to restrain them unto temporal pains and civil penalties, by which the censures of the church might remain as formerly. And, Fourthly, in order thereunto they had procured a Proviso to be entered in the House of Peers, "That the general words in this Bill should extend only to the High-Commission Court, and not reach other ecclesiastical jurisdictions;" for which consult our author, Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 425. Having thus passed over such matters as concern the church, we will now look upon some few things which relate to the Parliament. And the first is that —

FULLER.—I said not, Mr. Pym "had just cause to triumph;" yea, somewhat followeth in my History to the contrary, showing he had no reason to rejoice, and condemn the bishops herein, seeing not *supineness*, but prudential condescension, for the time, made them rather *sufferers* than *surprised* herein. Only I say, there are many alive, who heard him sing aloud this his *Victoria*, and the echo thereof it still soundeth in their ears.

The Animadvertor himself sometimes triumpheth over my mistakes, and carrieth me away in his own conceit; whilst still I am sensible of my own liberty, that I am in a free condition.

290. DR. HEYLIN.—"Dr. Pocklington and Dr. Bray were the two first that felt the displeasures of it; the former for preaching and printing—the latter for licensing—two books, one called 'Sunday no Sabbath,' the other 'the Christian Altar.'" (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 412.) No other way to pacify the high displeasures of the bishop of Lincoln, but by such a sacrifice; who therefore is intrusted to gather such propositions out of those two books as were to be recanted by the one, and for which the other was to be deprived of all his preferments. And in this the bishop served his own turn, and the people's too. *His own turn* first, in the great controversy of the altar, in which he was so great a stickler, and in which Pocklington was thought to have provoked him to take that revenge. *The people's turn* he served next, in the condemning and recanting of some points about the sabbath; though therein he ran cross to his former practice; who had been, not

long since, so far from those sabbatarian rigours, (which now he would fain be thought to countenance,) that he caused a comedy to be acted before him at his house at Bugden, not only on a Sunday in the afternoon, but upon such a Sunday also on which he had publicly given sacred orders both to priests and deacons. And to this comedy he invited the earl of Manchester, and divers of the neighbouring gentry.

FULLER.—I was neither an actor in, nor a spectator of, that comedy. “The better day, the worse deed.” I recount it amongst none of those his good works wherewith he abounded.

DR. HEYLIN.—Though, on this turning of the tide, he did not only cause these Doctors to be condemned for some opinions which formerly himself allowed of, but moved, at the Assembly in Jerusalem-Chamber, that all books should be publicly burnt, which had disputed the morality of the Lord’s-day sabbath. *Quo teneam nodo*, &c. as the poet hath it.

FULLER.—I have been credibly informed, that when, in Jerusalem-Chamber, Mr. Stephen Marshall urged most vehemently for severe punishment on the authors of those books; bishop Williams fell foul on the books, moving they might be burned, that their authors might the better escape. Let every one betine\* his share herein.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, whereas our author tells us in the following words, that “soon after both the Doctors deceased for grief,” I dare with some confidence tell him, there was no such matter; Dr. Pocklington living about two years, and Dr. Bray above four years after, with as great cheerfulness and courage as ever formerly. How he hath dealt with Dr. Cosin, we shall see more at large hereafter in a place by itself; the discourse thereof being too long and too full of particulars, to come within the compass of an Animadversion.† In the mean time, proceed we unto bishop Wren, of whom thus as followeth:—

FULLER.—I went to Peterborough on purpose, in quest after information, and saw Dr. Pocklington’s grave; on the same token, it was in the churchyard, just in the place where so many Saxons were murdered and martyred by the Danes: and there I heard, that he enjoyed not himself after his censure. Of Dr. Bray

\* This obsolete word, of Chaucer’s age, is a derivative from *tine* or *tind*, from which comes our noun *tinder*; and both the primitive verb and its compounds signify *to burn*, *to kindle*, &c. How appropriately it was employed in this sense by Fuller, the context will show.—EDIT.

† Dr. Cosin’s very able defence of himself is now given entire, from HEYLIN’S *Examen*, at the close of this volume, with some additional information.—EDIT.

(though I could) I say nothing ; and shall return an answer to Dr. Cosin at the end of this book. Our author proceeds :—

291. DR. HEYLIN.—“ A Bill was sent up by the Commons against Matthew Wren, bishop of Ely, containing twenty-five Articles,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 427.) That such a Bill was sent up from the House of Commons, is undoubtedly true. And no less true it is, that many impeachments of like nature were hammered, at and about the same time, against many other clergymen of good note, though inferior order ; the Articles whereof were printed and exposed to open sale, to their great disparagement. And therefore I would fain know the reason why this man should be singled out amongst all the rest to stand *impeached* upon record in our author’s History ; especially considering that there was nothing done by the Lords in pursuance of it, *the impeachment* dying, in a manner, as soon as born. Was it because he was more criminal than the others were, or that the charge was better proved, or for what cause else ?

FULLER.—I will give the reader a true and fair account thereof. Many clergymen (as the Animadvertor observeth) being then articulated against, I thought, *to insert all* would clog my book with needless numbers, as *to omit all* would be interpreted partiality and unfaithfulness in an Historian. I chose therefore the middle (as the safest) way, to instance in four ; two Doctors, Bray and Pocklington ; one Dean, John Cosin ; and one Bishop, Matthew Wren ; conceiving these a sufficient representation of all the rest. Wherefore I cannot see how the Animadvertor can properly say, that bishop Wren was by me “singled out,” except a quaternion be a single man. It was not because his charge was better (which for aught I know was not at all) proved, but for these reasons :—

1. He was one of the first in time, clamoured against.
2. He was one of the highest in dignity, clamoured against.
3. He was one that hath longest been a sufferer for his un-prosecuted accusation.

And here, had the Animadvertor been pleased as well to take notice of flowers and herbs in my Church-History, as what he counteth weeds therein, he might have inserted (yea, with justice could not have omitted) this following passage : “ Bishop Wren’s long imprisonment (being never brought-in to a public answer) hath converted many of his adversaries into a more charitable opinion of him.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 444.)

DR. HEYLIN.—Well, since our author will not, I will tell you, why (he singled out Matthew Wren amongst all the rest) : and I will tell it in the words of king James, in the Conference at Hampton-Court, upon occasion of a needless exception taken by Dr. Reynolds at a

passage in Ecclesiasticus : " What, trow ye," said the king, " makes these men so angry with Ecclesiasticus ? By my sal, I think he was a bishop, or else they would never use him so." And so much for that.

FULLER.—Whether Ecclesiasticus was a bishop or no, I know not ; this I know, that Ecclesiastes was a preacher. The words of kings are most proper for the mouths of kings ; and sovereigns may speak their pleasure to their subjects, which fit not fellow-subjects one to another. And so much for that.

My extraction—who was *Prebendarius Prebendarides*, and relation (as the Animadvertor knows) to two (no mean) bishops, my uncles—may clear me from any episcopal antipathy. I honour any who is a bishop ; both honour and love him who is a religious and learned bishop. Our author proceeds :—

292. DR. HEYLIN.—" About this time was the first motion of a new Protestation, to be taken all over England ; which, some months after, was generally performed." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 414.) What time this was, our author tells us in the margin, pointing to Feb. 4th ; about which time there was no mention of the Protestation, nor occasion for it. The first mention which was made of the Protestation was upon Monday, May 3d ; on which day it was mentioned, framed, and taken by all the members of the House of Commons, excepting the lord George Digby, (now earl of Bristol,) and an uncle of his.

FULLER.—I appeal to the surviving members of the House of Commons, (the most competent judges in this point,) whether such a Protestation was not hammered (though not perfected) about the date by me assigned.

Acts of State never ride post ; and it seems to me improbable, that the Protestation, by such unused approperation, to be mentioned, framed, and taken, all in one day. But herein I submit to those who best know it.

DR. HEYLIN.—The occasion of it was a speech made by the king, in the House of Peers, in favour of the earl of Strafford, upon the Saturday before ; which moved them to unite themselves by this Protestation, " for bringing to condign punishment all such as shall, either by force, practice, plots, counsels, conspiracies, or otherwise, do any thing to the contrary of any thing in the same Protestation contained." Which Protestation, being carried into the House of Peers, was, after some few days, generally taken by that House also. But the prevalent party in the House of Commons, having further aims than such as our author pleaseth to take notice of, first caused it to be printed by an Order of May 5th, that they might be sent down to " the Sheriffs and Justices of Peace in the several shires ;" to whom

they intimated, "that, as they justified the taking of it in themselves, so they could not but approve it in all such as should take it." But finding that this did not much edify with the country people, they desired the Lords to concur with them in imposing the same. Failing thereof, by an Order of their own House only, July 30th, it was declared, "that the Protestation made by them was fit to be taken by every person that was well-affected in religion, and to the good of the commonwealth; and, therefore, what person soever did not take the same was unfit to bear office in the church or commonwealth." Which notwithstanding, many refused to take it, as our author telleth us, not knowing but that some sinister use might be made thereof; as afterward appeared, by those Pikes and Protestations which conducted some of the five members to the House of Commons.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor and the author have in this paragraph lovingly shaken hands together, I fear, for meeting and parting at once; and that it will not be long before we disjoin them again. Our author proceeds:—

293. DR. HEYLIN.—"About this time came forth the lord Brooke's book against bishops, accusing them, in respect of their parentage, to be *de sæce populi*, 'of the dregs of the people;' and, in respect of their studies, no way fit for government, or to be barons in Parliament." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 428.) A passage misbecoming no man's pen so much as his that writ it; whose father neither was of a better extraction than some, nor better left, as in the way of his subsistence, than any of the bishops (whom he thus upbraideth) had been left by their fathers.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor will, I hope, acknowledge me a fair and ingenuous adversary, on a token best known to us alone. However, Christianity obligeth me to take no unworthy advantage of my brother in the same profession.

DR. HEYLIN.—From the first part of which calumny, the bishops freed themselves well enough, as appears by our author. And from the second, since they were too modest to speak in their own commendations, our author might have freed them, with one of the old tales which are in his budget. And the tale is of a nobleman in king Harry the eighth's time, who told Mr. Pace, one of the king's secretaries, in contempt of learning, "that it was enough for noblemen's sons to wind their horn, and carry their hawk fair; and to leave study and learning to the children of mean men." To whom the aforesaid Mr. Pace replied, "Then you and other noblemen must be content that your children may wind their horns, and keep their hawks, while the children of mean men do manage matters of estate."\* And certainly there can be no reason why men that

\* CAMDEN'S "Remains."

have been versed in books, studied in histories, and thereby made acquainted with the chief occurrences of most states and kingdoms, should not be thought as fit to manage the affairs of state, as those who spend their time in hawking and hunting, if not upon some worse employments. For, that a superinduction of holy orders should prove a *supersedeas* to all civil prudence, is such a wild, extravagant fancy as no man of judgment can allow of.

FULLER.—I never said it, nor thought it; I will never write a syllable against mine own vocation. The clergy, I am sure, cannot be impaired, and lay-noblemen, I hope, may be improved, (to make them more industrious to enable themselves,) by the Animadvertor's story, well reported, and better urged and applied. Our author proceeds:—

294. DR. HEYLIN.—“The next day the twelve subscribers were voted to be committed to the Tower; save that bishop Morton, of Durham, and Hall, of Norwich, found some favour.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 434.) Our author speaks this of those twelve bishops who had subscribed a Protestation for preserving their rights and votes in the House of Peers, during the time of their involuntary absence, to which they were compelled by threats, menaces, and some open acts of violence committed on them. But in the name of one of the bishops, who found the favour of not being sent unto the Tower, he is much mistaken; it not being Dr. Hall, bishop of Norwich, but Dr. Wright, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, who found that favour at their hands.

FULLER.—Not “*much*,” who (if at all) could not be *less* mistaken. I shall provide, God willing, the next edition shall be reformed herein; and mean time desire the owner of my former, to rectify it with their pen; who immediately can remove Coventry and Lichfield (though eighty miles' distance) to Norwich; and thereby he will much *Wright*\* me, and nothing at all *wrong* himself.

295. DR. HEYLIN.—The like misnomer I find after, where he speaks of “William earl of Bath;” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 440;) the earl of Bath of whom he speaks being named Henry, and not William, unless he changed his name when he succeeded in that earldom; as I think he did not, and I am sure our author will not say he did.

FULLER.—That noble earl, (questionable whether of more honour or learning,) so cordial to the cause of the church, (far from all “new-dipt sectaries,”) never changed his name, till he changed his life; and then of a militant became a triumphant saint. The reader will believe me knowing enough in his Christian name,

\* Alluding to the orthography of bishop Wright.—EDIT.



whose relict (since countess of Middlesex) was my late parishioner at Waltham, where I have seen his name above a thousand times, prefixed with his own hand-writing, before the several books in the numerous and choice library at Copt-hall. It was indeed a mere mistake of the printer.

296. DR. HEYLIN.—As much he is mistaken also in point of time, “leaving the bishops in prison for eighteen weeks;” whereas they were scarce detained there for half that time. For, being committed to the Tower in the end of December, they were released by an Order of the House of Peers on the 15th of February, being the next day after the Bill for taking away their votes had passed in Parliament. But then the Commons, looking on them as divested of their right of peerage, and consequently (as they thought) in the same rank with themselves, returned them to the Tower again: and, having kept them there some few weeks, (long enough to declare their power,) discharged them upon bail, and so sent them home.

FULLER.—A great cry and a little wool. 1. From the end of December to the 15th of February was seven weeks. 2. They continued afterwards there some few weeks, as the Animadvertor confesseth. Weeks imply two at the least; some few, denote four or five in proper sense. Lastly. Some of the bishops staid there longer than others, even for lack of money to pay their fees. If the reader be pleased to take all these up, he will find them fall little short of eighteen weeks. And let not the Animadvertor wilfully persist in an error, who may know from bishop Wren, that none of them were released before the 6th of May. Our author proceedeth:—

297. DR. HEYLIN.—“About this time the word ‘Malignant’ was first born (as to common use) in England; and fixed as a note of disgrace on those of the king’s party: and, because one had as good be dumb as not speak with the vulgar, possibly in that sense it may occur in our ensuing History.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 443.) Nothing more possible than that our author should make use of any word of disgrace with which the king’s party was reproached.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor, in this point, proves himself a Malignant indeed, taxing me with so odious and untrue an aspersion. Nothing more improbable, than that my hand should hurt that cause which my heart did honour in the writing of my book. Though this passage be by me premised by way of prevention, if the word “Malignant” casually fell from my pen; yet such was my cautiousness, that very rarely, if at all, it is used as mine own word. Besides, the ingenuous reader knoweth, that the writers of civil dissensions are sometimes necessitated, for differencing of parties, to use those terms they do not approve.

DR. HEYLIN.—And if he calls them formerly by the name of “Royalists” and “High Royalists,” as he sometimes doth; it was not because he thought them worthy of no worse a title, but because the name of “Malignant” had not then been born.

FULLER.—Not so. For then, since the name “Malignant” was born, I would have used it on them; which I do not. Those words of the Animadvertor, “worthy of no worse a title,” intimate as if Royalist and High-Royalist were bad titles; which, if not honourable, must be inoffensive. If “royal” (the primitive) be good, (a “*royal* law,” James ii. 8, “a *royal* priesthood,” 1 Peter ii. 9,) *Royalist* (the derivative) cannot be bad, much less *High-Royalist*, except height makes that bad (being added thereunto) which was good before.

DR. HEYLIN.—He cannot choose but know, that the name of “Roundhead” was born at the same time also; and that it was as common in the king’s party to call the Parliamentarians by the name of “Roundheads,” as it was with those of the Parliament party to call the king’s adherents by the name of “Malignants.” And yet I dare confidently say, that the word “Roundhead,” as it was fixed as a note of disgrace on the Parliament party, doth not occur, on any occasion whatsoever, in our author’s History. But “kissing goes by favour,” as the saying is; and therefore let him favour whom he pleases, and kiss where he favoureth.

FULLER.—I confess the name “Roundhead” at the same time trundled about in the mouths of many men. But I conceived it beneath an Historian to make use thereof; because his majesty, in all his proclamations, declarations, and other Acts of State, never made mention thereof, whilst “Malignant” was often used in Acts of Parliament.

But if my bare mention (not using) of “Malignant” be so distasteful, I will cut down all the ill wood therein to the last sprig, quench all the ill fire therein to the last spark; I mean, God willing, totally delete that paragraph in the next edition. Our author proceeds:—

298. DR. HEYLIN.—“By this time ten of the eleven bishops, formerly subscribing their Protestation to the Parliament, were, after some months’ durance, (upon good bail given,) released,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 443, 444.) Of the releasing of these bishops we have spoken already. We are now only to observe such mistakes and errors as relate unto it. And, First, they were not released at or about the time which our author speaks of; that is to say, after such time as the word “plunder” had begun to be used amongst us. Plunder, both name and thing, was unknown in England, till the beginning of the

war ; and the war began not till September, *anno* 1642, which was some months after the releasing of the bishops.

FULLER.—I hope now the Animadvertor is drawing to a conclusion ; because an ague commonly is leaving one, when beginning to double its fits. Formerly he found fault but once in four pages ; now four times in one paragraph.

Here is nothing mistimed in this point ; the name “plunder” beginning in England some months—the practice thereof some weeks—before our war. Indeed, *commissioned* plunder begun with the war, but *uncommissioned* plunder was before it ; committed by those whose activity only did authorize (or rather empower) them to take away the goods of others. Such were they that plundered (for I am sure they will not say, they robbed) the house of the countess Rivers at Long-Melford in Suffolk, before the University of Cambridge sent their plate to the king to York, and consequently before the war.

299. DR. HEYLIN.—Secondly. He telleth us, that ten of the eleven which had subscribed were released ; whereas, there were twelve which had subscribed, as appears, Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 433 ; whereof ten were sent unto the Tower, and the other two committed to the custody of the Black Rod. (*Idem.* p. 434.) And if ten only were released, the other two must be kept in custody for a longer time : whereas we find the bishop of Norwich at home in his diocess, and the bishop of Durham at liberty in London ; they being the two whom he makes so far favoured by the Parliament, as they scaped the Tower.

FULLER.—The small numeral fault shall be amended, to prevent exceptions, in my next edition.

300. DR. HEYLIN.—Thirdly. He telleth us, that, when all others were released, “bishop Wren was still detained in the Tower ;” which is nothing so. That bishop was released upon bail, when the other were ; returned unto his diocess, as the others did ; and there continued for a time ; when of a sudden he was snatched from his house at Downham, in the Isle of Ely, carried to the Tower, and there imprisoned ; never being brought unto a hearing, nor any cause shown for his imprisonment to this very day.

FULLER.—Would it were nothing so, indeed ! *Si mea cum vestris valuissent vota.* “If the Animadvertor’s and author’s joint desires might have taken effect,” there had been no difference about this passage in my book.

*Tuque domo propriâ, nos (te, Præsul,) poteremur.*

“Thou hadst enjoy’d thy house ; and we,  
Prelate, had enjoyed thee.”

But, alas ! it is so. He is still, and still, (when all other bishops

are released,) detained in the Tower ; where, I believe, he maketh “ God’s *service* his perfect *freedom*.” My words, as relating to the time when I wrote them, contain too much sorrowful truth therein.

301. DR. HEYLIN.—Fourthly. Archbishop Williams, after his restoring unto liberty, went not “into the king’s quarters,” as our author saith, but unto one of his own houses in Yorkshire ; where he continued till the year 1643, and then came to Oxford. Not that he found the north too cold for him, or the war too hot ; but to solicit for renewing of his *Commendam* in the deanery of Westminster ; the time for which he was to hold it drawing towards an end.

FULLER.—Nothing false or faulty. The archbishop of York stayed some weeks after his enlargement at Westminster ; thence he went privately to the house of sir Thomas Hedley, in Huntingdonshire ; and thence to his palace at Cawood, nigh York, where he gave the king a magnificent entertainment.

King James settled the deanery of Westminster under the Great Seal on Dr. Williams, so long as he should continue bishop of Lincoln. *Hinc illæ lacrimæ*, “hence the great heaving and huffing at him,” because he would not resign it, which was so signal a monument of his master’s favour unto him.

Being archbishop of York, king Charles confirmed his deanery unto him for three years, in lieu of the profits of his archbishopric, which the king had taken, *sede vacante*. So that it is probable enough, the renewing that term might be a joint motive of his going to Oxford.

But I see nothing which I have written can be cavilled at, except because I call Yorkshire “the king’s *quarters*,” which as yet was the king’s *whole*, when the archbishop first came thither, as being a little before the war began ; though, few weeks after, it became the king’s *quarters*. Such a prolepsis is familiar with the best historians ; and, in effect, is little more than when the Animadvertor calleth the “Gag” and *Appello Cæsarem*, the books of bishop Mountagu ; who, when they were written by him, was no (though soon after a) bishop.\* Our author proceeds :—

302. DR. HEYLIN.—“Some of the aged bishops had their tongues so used to the language of a *third Estate*, that more than once they ran on that (reputed) rock in their speeches, for which they were publicly shent, and enjoined an acknowledgment of their mistake.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 445.) By whom they were so “publicly shent,” and who they were that so ingenuously “acknowledged their mistake,” as my author telleth us not, so neither can I say whether it be true or false.

\* “Animadversions,” page 563.

FULLER.—I tell you again, It is true. The earl of Essex and the lord Say were two of the lords, (though this be more than I need discover,) who checked them. And of two of those bishops, Dr. Hall, late bishop of Norwich, is gone to God ; and the other is still alive.

DR. HEYLIN.—But I must needs say, that there was small ingenuity in acknowledging a mistake in that wherein they had not been mistaken ; or by endeavouring to avoid *a reputed* rock, to run themselves on *a certain* rock, even the rock of scandal.

FULLER.—Their brief and general acknowledgment, “that they were sorry that they had spoken in this point what had incurred the displeasure of the temporal lords,” was no trespass on their own ingenuity, nor had shadow of scandal to others therein.

I confess, men must not bear false witness, either against themselves or others ; nor may they betray their right, especially when they have not only *a personal concernment* therein, but also are in some sort *feoffees in trust* for posterity. However, when a predominant power plainly appears which will certainly over-rule their cause against them, without scandal they may (not to say, in Christian prudence they ought to) wave the vindication of their privileges for the present ; waiting, wishing, and praying, for more moderate and equal times, wherein they may assert their right with more advantage to their cause, and less danger to their persons.

DR. HEYLIN.—For that the English bishops had their vote in Parliament as “a third Estate,” and not in the capacity of temporal barons, will evidently appear by these reasons following:—For, First, the clergy in all other Christian kingdoms of these north-west parts make the third Estate ; that is to say, in the German empire, as appears by Thuanus the historian, lib. ii. In France, as is affirmed by Paulus Æmilius, lib. ix. In Spain, as testifieth Bodinus in his *De Repub.* lib. iii. For which consult also “the General History of Spain,” as in point of practice, lib. ix.—xi. xiv. In Hungary, as witnesseth Bonfinius, Dec. ii. lib. i. In Poland, as is verified by Thuanus also, lib. lvi. In Denmark, as Pontanus telleth us in *Historia Rerum Danicarum*, lib. vii. The Swedes observing anciently the same form and order of government as was used by the Danes. The like we find in Camden, for the realm of Scotland, in which anciently the lords spiritual (namely, bishops, abbots, priors) made the third Estate. And certainly it were very strange, if the bishops and other prelates in the realm of England, being a great and powerful body, should move in a lower sphere in England than they do elsewhere. But, Secondly, not to stand only upon probable inferences, we find first in the History of TITUS LIVIUS, touching the reign and acts of king Henry V. “that when his funerals were ended, the three Estates of the realm of Eng-

land did assemble together, and declared his son king Henry VI. being an infant of eight months old, to be their sovereign lord, as his heir and successor." And if the lords spiritual did not then make the third Estate, I would know who did. Thirdly. The petition tendered to Richard duke of Gloucester, to accept the crown, occurring in the Parliament Rolls, runs in the name of the three Estates of the realm; that is to say, "the lords spiritual, and temporal, and the Commons thereof." Fourthly. In the first Parliament of the said Richard, lately crowned king, it is said expressly, "that at the request and by the consent of the three Estates of this realm, that is to say, the lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons of this land, assembled in this present Parliament, and by authority of the same, it be pronounced, decreed, and declared, That our said sovereign lord the king was and is the very and undoubted king of this realm of England," &c. Fifthly. It is acknowledged so in the statute of 1 Elizabeth cap. 3, where the Lords spiritual and temporal, and the Commons, in that Parliament assembled, being said expressly, and *in terminis*, to represent the three Estates of this realm of England, did recognise the queen's majesty to be their "true, lawful, and undoubted sovereign liege lady and queen." Add unto these the testimony of sir Edward Coke, though a private person, who in his book of the "Jurisdiction of Courts," (published by order of the Long Parliament, chap. i.) doth expressly say, that "the Parliament consists of the head and body; that the head is the king, that the body are the three Estates, namely, the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons." In which words we have not only the opinion and testimony of that learned lawyer, but the authority of the Long Parliament also, though against itself. Those aged bishops had been but little studied in their own concernments, and betrayed their rights, if any of them did acknowledge any such mistake in challenging to themselves the name and privileges of the third Estate.

FULLER.—In this long discourse, the Animadvertor hath given in the several particulars, whereof I, in my Church-History, gave the total sum,—when saying, that there were "passages in the old Statutes, which did countenance the bishops sitting in Parliament in the capacity of a third Estate."

I have nothing to return in opposition, and heartily wish that his arguments (to use the seaman's phrase) may prove "stanch and tight, to hold water," when some Common-Lawyer shall examine them.

But seeing the Animadvertor hath, with his commendable pains, gone so far in this point, I could wish he had gone a little further, even to answer the two common objections against *the third Estate-ship* of bishops.

The First is this: The bishop (not to speak of bishops suffragan) of the Isle of Man is a bishop for all purposes and intents of jurisdiction and ordination; yet hath he no place in Parliament,

because not holding *per integram Baroniam*, “by an entire barony.” Now, if bishops sate in Parliament as *a third Estate*, and not as so many barons, why hath not the bishop of Man, being in the province of York, a place in Parliament, as well as the rest?

Secondly. If the bishops sit as *a third Estate*, then Statutes made without them are manc and defective; which in law will not be allowed, seeing there were some sessions of Parliament wherein Statutes did pass, *excluso clero*, (at leastwise, *absente clero*,) which, notwithstanding, are acknowledged obligatory to our nation.

I also request him, when his hand is in, to satisfy the objection, taken from a passage\* in the Parliament at Northampton under Henry II. when the bishops challenged their peerage; namely, *Non sedemus hîc Episcopi, sed Barones: nos Barones, vos Barones, praes hîc sumus*: “We sit not here as bishops, but as barons: we are barons, you are barons; here we are peers:” which is much enforced by anti-episcopists. And whereas the Animadvertor translated it “not as bishops only,” it is more than questionable that this interpolation “*only*” will not be admitted by such who have a mind curiously to examine the matter.

I protest my integrity herein, that I have not started these objections of myself, having had them urged against me; and though I can give a bungling answer unto them, I desire that the Animadvertor (being better skilled in law) would be pleased (if it ever comes again in his way) to return an answer as short and clear as the objections are; and I, and many more, will be bound to return him thanks. Our author proceeds:—

303, 304. DR. HEYLIN.—“The Convocation now not sitting, and many matters of religion being brought under the cognizance of the Parliament, their Wisdoms adjudged it not only convenient, but necessary, that some prime clergymen might be consulted with.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 445.) It seems, then, that the setting up of the new Assembly, consisting of certain lords and gentlemen, and two or more divines out of every county, must be ascribed to the not-sitting of the Convocation. Whereas if that had been the reason, the Convocation should have been first warned to re-assemble, with liberty and safe-conducts given them to attend that service, and freedom to debate such matters as conduced to the peace of the church. If on those terms they had not met, the substituting of the new Assembly might have had some ground: though being called and nominated as they were by the House of Commons, nothing they did could bind the clergy, further than as they were compellable by the power of the sword. But the truth is, the Convocation was not held fit to be

\* Alleged by the Animadvertor, formerly in his fourth book. (See page 440.)



trusted in the present designs ; there being no hope that they would ever give consent to the change of the government, or to the abrogating of the Liturgy of the church of England ; in all which the divines of their own nomination were presumed to serve them. And so accordingly they did, advancing their Presbyteries in the place of Episcopacy, their Directory in the room of the Common-Prayer Book, their Confession to the quality of the Book of Articles : all of them so short-lived, of so little continuance, that none of them passed over their probationer's year. Finally. Having served the turn, amused the world, with doing nothing, they made their *exit*, with far fewer *plaudits* than they expected at their entrance. In the recital of whose names, our author craves pardon for omitting the greatest part of them, as unknown to him : whereas he might have found them all in the Ordinance of the Lords and Commons by which they were called and empowered to be an Assembly. Of which pardon he afterwards presumes, in case he hath not marshalled them in their seniority ; because, saith he,——

FULLER.—The Animadvertor now enters the list with the Wisdoms in Parliament, who are most able to justify their own act. Mean time my folly may stand by in silence, unconcerned to return any answer.

305. DR. HEYLIN.—“ It savours something of a prelatical spirit to be offended about precedence.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 447.) I see our author is no changeling ; *primus ad extremum similis sibi*, “ the very same at last as he was at the first.” Certainly, if it savour of a prelatical spirit to contend about precedencies, that spirit by some Pythagorean metempsychosis hath passed into the bodies of the Presbyterians, whose pride had swelled them in conceit above kings and princes, and thus cometh home to our author. Nothing more positive than that of Travers, (one of our author's shining lights, for so he calls him, Ch. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 128—131,) in his book of Discipline : *Huic disciplinæ omnes principes submittere fasces suos necesse est*, as his words there are. Nothing more proud and arrogant than that of the Presbyterians in queen Elizabeth's time, who used frequently to say, that “ kings and queens must lay down their sceptres, and lick up the very dust of the church's feet,” that is, their own.\* And this, I trow, doth not savour so much of a prelatical as a papal spirit. Diogenes the Cynic, affecting a vainglorious poverty, came into Plato's chamber, and trampled the bed and other furniture thereof under his feet, using these words : *Calco Platonis fastum*, that he “ trampled on the pride of Plato.” To which Plato very gravely answered, *Sed majori fastu*, intimating that the Cynic “ showed more pride ” in that foolish action, than all the ornaments of his chamber could accuse him of. Our author need not travel far for the application ; it comes home unto him.

\* ROGERS in Preface to the “ Articles.”

FULLER.—If it cometh home unto me, I will endeavour (God willing) to thrust it far from me, by avoiding the odious sin of pride. And I hope the Presbyterians will herein make a *real and practical refutation* of this note, in evidencing more humility hereafter; seasonably remembering, “they are grafted on the stock” of the bishops, and are concerned “not to be high-minded but to fear; lest if God spared not” Episcopacy, (for what sins I am not to inquire,) peaceably possessed, above a thousand years, of power in the church of England, “take heed that he spare not” Presbytery also; which is but a probationer on its good behaviour, especially if by their insolence they offend God and disoblige our nation, the generality whereof is not over-fond of their government. Our author proceeds:—

306, 307. DR. HEYLIN.—“We listen not to their fancy who have reckoned the words in the Covenant, six hundred sixty-six,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 453.) I must confess myself not to be so much a Pythagorean, as to find divinity in numbers, nor am taken with such mysteries as some fancy in them. And yet I cannot choose but say, that the number of six hundred sixty-six words, neither more nor less, which are found in the Covenant, though they conclude nothing, yet they signify something. Our author cannot choose but know what pains were taken, even in the times of Irenæus, to find out Antichrist by this number; some thinking then, that they had found it in *Λατίνος*, with reference to the persecuting Roman emperors. Some protestants think that they had found it in a dedication to pope Paul the fifth, which was *Paulo Vto Vice Deo*; the numeral letters whereof, that is to say, D. C. L. V. V. V. I. amount exactly unto six hundred sixty-six, which is “the number of the beast” in Revelation. The papists, on the other side, find it in the name of Luther; but in what language or how spelled, I remember not. And therefore, whosoever he was which made this observation upon the Covenant, he deserves more to be commended for his wit, than condemned for his idleness. But much less is our author pleased with their parallel, who, finding this Covenant to consist of six branches, compare it to the terrible Statute of the Six Articles made by Harry VIII. And not compared so without cause: For, though I cannot say, that the Ordinance which enjoined the Covenant did draw so much blood from the poor protestants as that Statute did; yet I may warrantably say, that there were more families undone by the one, than lives lost by the other. And, Secondly, it may be said, (I fear, too truly,) that though the Covenant were written in ink, it was sealed with blood; many thousands of true English protestants having lost their lives by the coming-in of the Scottish armies, drawn into England, in pursuance of this band or covenant. So that the lashes of each whip being equal in number, our author hath no reason to be displeased with

them that made that parallel, though he may have some reason to himself not to applaud them.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor might herein have allowed me the liberty of preterition, a familiar figure in all authors, managed by them with, *Taceo, prætermitto, transeo*, “We pass by,” “listen not,” &c. when relating things either *parva*, “of small moment;” *nota*, “generally known;” or *ingrata*, “unwelcome,” to many readers.

Under which of these three notions the point in hand doth fall, I am not bound to discover. Our author proceeds:—

308—310. DR. HEYLIN.—“Now began the great and general purgation of the clergy in the Parliament’s quarters, &c. Some of whose offences were so foul, it is a shame to report them, crying to justice for punishment.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 459.) And it was time that such a purgation should be made, if “their offences were so foul” as our author makes them. But, first, our author might have done well to have satisfied himself in all particulars, before he raised so foul a scandal on his Christian brethren, and not to have taken them up upon hearsay, or on no better grounds than the credit of the “First Century,” which he after mentions. Which modesty he might have learnt, 1. From the author of that scandalous and infamous pamphlet, (whatsoever he was,) desisting from the writing of a “Second Century,” as being sensible that “the subject was generally odious.” And certainly, if it were odious in that party to write the same, it must be much more odious in our author to defend the writing. He might have learnt it, 2. From the most excellent master in the schools of piety and morality which this age hath given us, even the king himself; who, as our author telleth us, would not give way that any such book should be written “of the vicious lives of some Parliament-ministers,” when such an undertaking was presented to him. (*Idem*, p. 460.) But if “their offences were so foul,” the writer of the “Century” had some reason for what he did, and our author had some reason for what he saith, especially if the putting-in of one herb had not spoiled all the pot of pottage. But, First, *Qui alterum incusat probri seipsum intueri oportet*, is a good rule in the schools of prudence; and therefore it concerns our author to be sure of this,—that all things be well at home, both in his own person and in his family, before he throw so much foul dirt in the face of his brethren. In which respect Manutius was conceived to be the unfittest man in Rome (as indeed he was) to perform the office of a Censor, though most ambitiously he affected and attained that dignity; of whom it is affirmed by Velleius Paterculus, *nec quicquam objicere potuit adolescentibus quod non agnosceret senex*, that is to say, “that he was able to object no crime to the younger sort, of which himself, being then well in years, was not also guilty.” And, Secondly, *Non temerè de fratre mali aliquid credendum esse*, was anciently a rule in the

schools of charity; which our author either hath forgotten, or else never learned. He would otherwise have examined the proofs, before he had pronounced the sentence; and not have positively condemned these poor men for such "foul offences as cried to justice for punishment;" and of such "scandalous enormities" as were not fit to be covered with the mantle of charity. But he takes himself up at last with a doubt, that there might want sufficient proof to convict them of it. "Nothing," saith he, "can be said in their excuse, if (what was the main matter) their crimes were sufficiently proved." And if they "were not sufficiently proved," as indeed they were not, (no witness coming-in upon oath to make good the charge,) our author hath sufficiently proved himself an unrighteous judge, an *accusator fratrum*, as we know who is, in accusing and condemning them for "scandalous enormities and foul offences," branding them by the name of BAAL, and calling them "unsavoury salt, not fit to be thrown upon the dung-hill;" yet all this while to be unsatisfied in the sufficiency of the proof. *Decedis ab officio religiosi judicis*,\* is the least that can be said here; and I say no more. Only I note, what sport was made by that "Century" then, and may be made hereafter of this part of the History, in the Court of Rome; to which the libellous pamphlets of Martin-Mar-Prelate, published in queen Elizabeth's time, served for authentic witnesses and sufficient evidence to disgrace this church. Nor have they spared to look upon this whole business as an act of divine retaliation, in turning so many of the regular and orthodox clergy out of their benefices and preferments by our new Reformers, under colour of some "scandalous enormities" by them committed; under pretence whereof so many poor monks and friars were (as they say) turned out of their cells with like *humanity* by those who had the first hammering of the Reformation here by law established.

FULLER.—First, as to myself, who am most knowing of my own infirmities: I will confess them to God, and not plead for them before man. If God's restraining grace hath bridled me from scandalous obnoxiousness, may He alone have the honour thereof. As for other stains and spots upon my soul, I hope that He (be it spoken without the least verbal reflection) who is the FULLER's sope † will scour them forth with his merit, that I may appear clean by God's mercy.

I know full well who it is that is termed "the accuser of his brethren," even Satan himself, Rev. xii. 13. Hence it is that one observeth, he hath his name, Διάβολος *Diabolus*, "Devil," and so also in Italian, French, Spanish, with some small variation; it being good reason, that he should keep his *name* in all countries, who keeps his *nature* in all places, being a constant delator and traducer of God's servants, often without cause, always without measure.

\* MINUTIUS FELIX. † Mal. iii. 2.

But, I hope, I may say in this point, "Get thee behind me, Satan." I mean, I may justly thrust both name and thing far from me, even to light where it deserveth.

Some of my brethren, or fathers rather, I reverence and admire for their eminences : others I commend and will endeavour to imitate : others, guilty of human infirmities, I desire to conceal their faults, and (that not taking effect) to excuse their persons : such as are past my pleading for, fall under my pity and have my prayers that God would amend them. But willingly, much less causelessly, I will not accuse any ; and my pen and tongue hath been and shall be tender of their reputations.

Proceed I now to what I have written concerning the sequestered clergy of England ; wherein I will freely (God willing) unbosom my mind ; and "if I perish, I perish." I appeal to the Searcher of hearts, if I did not desire to do them all just favour, as I hope to find favour from Him when I most need it. But as mariners, when they have both wind and tide against them, cannot make their desired port in a straight line, and therefore are fain to fetch a compass ; semnably,\* I, desiring to gratify my brethren, and not destroy myself, was fain to go about, that in any measure I might with safety do it. And there was no *compassing* of it without *compace-ing* it ; no reaching the end without going out of the way.

First, therefore, I did acknowledge what indeed could not be concealed, and what, in truth, must be confessed ; namely, that some of the ejected clergy were guilty of foul offences ; to whom, and whom alone, the name of BAAL and "unsavoury salt" did relate. Nor was it a wonder, if, amongst ten thousand and more, some were guilty of "scandalous enormities."

This being laid down, and yielded to the violence of the times, I wrought myself by degrees (as much as I durst) to insert what followeth, in vindication of many others, rigorously cast out for following, in their affections, their preceding judgments and consciences ; and no scandal could justly be charged upon them, pleading for them as ensueth :—

"1. The witnesses against them were seldom deposed on oath, but their bare complaints believed.

"2. Many of the complainers were factious people, (those most accusing their sermons who least heard them,) and who since have deserted the church, as hating the profession of the ministry.

"3. Many were charged with delivering false doctrines, whose positions were found, at the least, disputable. Such, those accused for preaching that 'baptism washeth away original sin ;' which the

\* On this word see "the Editor's Preface" to Ch. Hist. vol. i.—EDIT.

most learned and honest in the Assembly, in some sense, will not deny; namely, that in the children of God it cleanseth the condemning and final peaceable commanding power of original sin, though the stain and blemish thereof doth still remain.

“4. Some were merely outed for their affections to the king’s cause; and what was *malignity* at London was *loyalty* at Oxford.

“5. Yea, many moderate men of the opposite party much bemoaned such severity, that some clergymen, blameless for life, and orthodox for doctrine, were ejected only on the account of their faithfulness to the king’s cause. And as much corruption was let out by this ejection, (many scandalous ministers deservedly punished,) so at the same time the veins of the English church were emptied of much good blood, (some inoffensive pastors,) which hath made her body hydropical ever since; ill humours succeeding in the room, by reason of too large and sudden evacuation.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 459, 460.)

This, being written by me, some ten [years since], (in the paroxysm of the business,) and printed some four years since, was as much as then I durst say for my brethren, without running myself into apparent danger.

If the papists take advantage at what I have written, I can wash my hands. I have given them no just occasion; and I hope this my just defence will prove satisfactory to the ingenuous,—that I did not designedly detract from any of my brethren. But, if this my plea finds no acceptance, and if I must groan under so unjust an accusation, I will endeavour to follow the counsel of the prophet: “I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against Him, until He plead my cause, and execute judgment for me: He will bring me forth to the light, and I shall behold His righteousness,” Micah vii. 9.

311. DR. HEYLIN.—But, to say truth, it is no wonder, if he concur with others in the condemnation of particular persons, since he concurs with others in the condemnation of the church itself. For, speaking of the separation made by Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, &c. he professeth, that he rather doth believe, that “the sinful corruptions of the worship and government of this church, taking hold on their consciences, and their inability to comport any longer therewith,” was rather “the true cause” of their deserting of their country, than that it was for debt or danger, as Mr. Edwards, in a book of his, had suggested of them. (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 461, 462.) What grounds Mr. Edwards had for his suggestion, I inquire not now; though, coming from the pen of one who was no friend unto the government and Liturgy of the church of England, it might have met with greater credit in our



author. For, if these men be not allowed for witnesses against one another, the church would be in worse condition than the ancient Borderers: amongst whom, though the testimony of an Englishman against a Scot, or of a Scot against the English, (in matters of spoil and depredation,) could not find admittance; yet a Scot's evidence against a Scot was beyond exception. *Lege inter limitaneos cautum, ut nullus nisi Anglus in Anglum, nullus nisi Scotus in Scotum, testis admittatur*, as we read in Camden.\* We see by this, as by other passages, which way our author's bowl is biassed, how constantly he declares himself in favour of those who have either separated from the church, or appeared against it. Rather than such good people shall be thought to forsake the land for "debt or danger," the church shall be accused for laying the heavy burden of conformity upon their consciences, which neither they, nor their forefathers, (the old English Puritans,) were resolved to bear. For what else were those "sinful corruptions" of this church in government and worship, which laid hold of their consciences, (as our author words it,) but the government of the church by bishops, the rites and ceremonies of the church here by law established? which yet must be allowed of by our author as the more true and real cause of their separation, than that which we find in Mr. Edwards.

FULLER.—I knew Mr. Edwards very well, my contemporary in Queen's College, who often was transported beyond due bounds with the keenness and eagerness of his spirit; and, therefore, I have just cause in some things to suspect him; especially being informed and assured the contrary from credible persons.

As for the five dissenting members, Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Bridge, Mr. Burroughs, (to whom Mr. Archer may be reduced,) they owed not eighteen pence a-piece to any in England; and carried over with them no contemptible sums in their purses.

As for lay gentlemen and merchants that went over with them, such as peruse their names will be satisfied in their responsible, yea, plentiful estates.

SIR MATTHEW BOINTON;

SIR WILLIAM CONSTABLE;

SIR RICHARD SALTINGTON;

MR. LAWRENCE, *since Lord President of the Council*;

MR. ANDREWS, *since Lord Mayor of London*;

MR. BOWRCHER;

MR. ASK, *since a Judge*;

MR. JAMES;

MR. WHITE.

\* *Annales Elizabethæ.*



And although the last of these failed beyond the seas, (a catching casualty with great undertakings,) yet was he known to have a very great estate at his going over.

Yea, I am most credibly informed, by such who (I am confident) will not abuse me and posterity therein, that Mr. Herbert Palmer, (an Anti-Independent to the height,) being convinced that Mr. Edwards had printed some falsehoods in one sheet of his *Gangræna*, proffered to have that sheet reprinted at his own cost, but some intervening accident obstructed it.

312. DR. HEYLIN.—Nor can our author save himself by his parenthesis, in which he tells us, that he uses their language only. For, using it without check or censure, he makes it his own as well as theirs, and justifies them in the action which he should have condemned.

“Here Mr. Christopher Love gave great offence to the Royalists in his sermon, showing the impossibility of an agreement,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 470.) This happened at the treaty at Uxbridge, where he had thrust himself (as the Commissioners affirmed) upon that attendance. And for the words at which the offence was taken, they were these; namely, that “the king’s Commissioners came with hearts full of blood, and that there was as great distance between that treaty and peace, as between heaven and hell.” \* For which, though some condemn him for want of charity, and others for want of discretion; yet our author seems more willing to have men’s censures fall lightly on him, “because since he hath suffered, and so satisfied here for his faults in this or any other kind.” This rule I both approve and am willing to practise, and could wish our author were so minded; who will not let the archbishop of Canterbury be at rest in his grave after all his sufferings, notwithstanding the great difference between the persons, and the impulsives to their deaths. But Mr. Love was Mr. Love; and bishop Laud was but a bishop, to whom now we come.

FULLER.—This is an hypercriticism which I never heard of before, and now do not believe. In opposition whereunto I return, First, that if a writer doth slyly weave another author’s words into his own cloth, using them without any quotation, then indeed he adopts them his own.

Secondly. If he cite the words, with commendation or explicit approbation of them, then also he *as-selfeth* them, undertakes for them, and is bound to justify them.

Thirdly. But if he but barely cite the words, without any emphasis of praise or dispraise, (the case now in hand,) it amounts to no more than unto a *Valeat quantum valere potest*, or a *Sit fides penes authorem*; it being left to the reader’s liberty, to believe more or less or nothing thereof, as the author he citeth seemeth to

\* “Treaty at Uxbridge,” p. 31.

be more or less or not at all credible, to his discretion. Our author proceeds:—

313. DR. HEYLIN.—“As appears by his own Diary, which, if evidence against him for his faults, may be used as a witness of his good works.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 472.) The Diary which our author speaks of, was the archbishop’s practical commentary on those words of David, “Teach me, O Lord, so to number my days, that I may apply my heart unto wisdom.”

FULLER.—I appeal to the reader of my History, whether I have not given his Diary the due commendation, thus writing thereof:—

“He was conscientious, according to the principles of his devotion; witness his care in keeping a constant Diary of the passages in his life. Now, he can hardly be an ill husband who sums up his receipts and expenses every night; and such a soul is or would be good, which enters daily into a scrutiny of his own actions. Now, an exact Diary is a window into his heart who maketh it; and, therefore, pity it is that any should look therein, but either the friends of the party, or such ingenuous foes as will not (especially in things doubtful) make conjectural comments to his disgrace.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 475.)

DR. HEYLIN.—No memorable passage happened in the whole course of his life, till the end of May, 1633, (when his papers were seized on by Mr. Prynne,) which he had not booked in a Memorial by the way of a Diary or Journal. Out of which, though Mr. Prynne excerpted nothing but that which he conceived might tend most visibly to his disgrace and disadvantage, and published it to that end in print; yet when it came to the perusal of equal and indifferent men, it was so far from “serving as an evidence of his faults,” (as our author words it,) that it showed him to be a man of exemplary piety in himself, unmoved fidelity to his friend, of most perfect loyalty to his master, and honest affections to the public, &c.

FULLER.—If I were delighted in carping at slips of pen or press, I here have advantage enough, the Animadvertor affirming that the archbishop’s papers were seized by Mr. Prynne [in May] 1633; at which time Mr. Prynne was in no capacity to make such a seizure, being himself in trouble about his *Histriomastix*; and the date (though not confessed in the *errata*) is no doubt misprinted for 1643.\* Thus I behold him who carps at such trifles, like one suing his neighbour for *pedibus ambulando*, when, though the jury must find for the plaintiff, yet he is looked on but as a vexatious person for his pains. I could wish that all cavilling at prelat mistakes might be forborne, and that every one would read his adver-

\* See page 350 in which the *errata* are enumerated.—EDIT.

sary's book as in his conscience he conceiveth it intended by the writer, that so, waving all typographical escapes, they may come the sooner to the cause controverted betwixt them.

DR. HEYLIN.—He that shall look upon the list of the things projected to be done, and in part done, by him, (fol. 28, 29,) will find, that both his heart was set on, and his hand engaged in, many excellent pieces of work, tending to the great honour and benefit both of church and state ; not incident to a man of such narrow comprehensions, as some of his professed enemies were pleased to make him. Certain I am, that as Mr. Prynne lost his end, so he could not get much thanks for that piece of service.

FULLER.—If “Mr. Prynne lost his end,” he shall have no direction from me for the finding thereof.

I never beheld the archbishop as a man of narrow comprehensions, but as one who had in his head and heart stowage enough for great undertakings. Only I could wish that his apprehensions had been adequate to his comprehensions ; I mean, that he had lived to perfect what he projected, and do what he commendably designed for pious uses, and the public good. Our author goes on :—

314. DR. HEYLIN.—“He is generally charged with popish inclinations ; and the story is commonly told and believed of a lady,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 473.) Here is a charge of the archbishop's inclination unto popery, and the proof nothing but a tale, and the tale of a lady.

*Quid vento ? Mulier. Quid muliere ? Nihil.*

The substance of the tale is this, that a certain lady, (if any lady may be certain,) who, turning papist, &c.

FULLER.—I will take the boldness to English his Latin verse, that the weaker sex may see the strength of his charity unto them :—

“What 's more fickle than the wind ?  
Even a woman in her mind.  
Fickler what 's than woman-kind ?  
Nothing in the world we find.”

DR. HEYLIN.—This lady who turned papist was asked by the archbishop the cause of her changing ; to which she answered, “that it was because she always hated to go in a crowd.” And being asked the meaning of that expression, she replied again, that she perceived his lordship, and many others, making haste to Rome ; and therefore, to prevent going in a press, she had gone before them. Whether this tale be true or false, though he doth not know, yet he resolves to set it down, and to set it down also with this *item*,—that “it was generally believed.” Be it so for once.

FULLER.—This sarcasm was put upon him by a lady, now living in London, and a countess, whose husband's father\* the archbishop married, and thereby brought much trouble and molestation to himself. No Œdipus needeth to unriddle the person, easily spelled by putting the premisses together.

DR. HEYLIN.—For, not being able to disprove it, I shall quit our author with one story, and satisfy the equal reader with another. First. For my author : I have heard a tale of a lady too, to whose table one Mr. Fuller was a welcome though a frequent guest ; and being asked once by her, Whether he would please to eat the wing of a woodcock, he would needs put her to the question, how her ladyship knew it was a wood-cock, and not a wood-hen. And this he pressed with such a troublesome importunity, that at last the lady answered with some show of displeasure, that “the woodcock was Fuller-headed, Fuller-breasted, Fuller-thighed, and, in a word, every way FULLER.” Whether this tale be true or false, I am not able to say ; but, “being generally believed,” I have set it down also.

FULLER.—His tale doth not quit mine, which was true and new, never printed before. Whereas his is *old*, (made, it seems, on one of my name, printed before I was born,) and *false*, never by man or woman retorted on me.

However, if it doth quit mine, he is now but even with me ; and hereafter I shall be above him, by forbearing any bitter return.

I had rather my name should make *many* causelessly merry, than *any* justly sad ; and sceing it lieth equally open and obvious to praise and dispraise, I shall as little be elated when flattered, “FULLER of wit and learning,” as dejected when flouted, “FULLER of folly and ignorance.”

All this, which the Animadvertor hath said on my name, I behold as nothing ; and as the anagram of his name, HEYLIN, *nehili*, “nothing worth.”

315. DR. HEYLIN.—But my other story is more serious, intended for the satisfaction of our author and the reader both. It was in November, *anno* 1639, that I received a message from the lord archbishop to attend him the next day at two of the clock in the afternoon. The key being turned which opened the way into his study, I found him sitting in a chair, holding a paper in both hands, and his eyes so fixed upon that paper, that he observed me not at my coming in. Finding him in that posture, I thought it fit and manners to retire again. But the noise I made by my retreat bringing him back unto himself, he recalled me again ; and told me, after some short pause, that he well remembered that he had sent for me, but could not tell

\* Charles Blount, created earl of Devon.—EDIT.

for his life what it was about. After which he was pleased to say, (not without tears standing in his eyes,) that he had then newly received a letter, acquainting him with a revolt of a person of some quality in North Wales, to the church of Rome; that he knew that the increase of popery, by such frequent revolts, would be imputed unto him and his brethren the bishops, who were all least guilty of the same; that, for his part, he had done his utmost, so far forth as it might consist with the rules of prudence, and the preservation of the church, to suppress that party, and to bring the chief sticklers in it to condign punishment; to the truth whereof (lifting up his wet eyes to heaven) he took God to witness; conjuring me, (as I would answer it to God at the day of judgment,) that if ever I came to any of those places which he and his brethren, by reason of their great age, were not like to hold long, I would employ all such abilities as God had given me in suppressing that party who, by their open undertakings and secret practices, were like to be the ruin of this flourishing church. After some words of mine upon that occasion, I found some argument to divert him from those sad remembrances; and, having brought him to some reasonable composedness, I took leave for the present; and, some two or three days after, waiting on him again, he then told me the reason of his sending for me the time before. And this I deliver for a truth on the faith of a Christian; which I hope will overbalance any evidence which hath been brought to prove such popish inclinations, as he stands generally charged with in our author's History.

FULLER.—I verily believe all and every one of these passages to be true, and therefore may proceed. Our author proceeds:—

316. DR. HEYLIN.—“However, most apparent it is, by many passages in his life, that he endeavoured to take up many controversies betwixt us and the church of Rome.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 474.) And this indeed is *novum crimen*, that is to say, “a crime of a new stamp,” never coined before.

FULLER.—I call it not *novum crimen*, which I believe was, in him, according to his principles, *pium propositum*; but, let me also add, was *frustraneus conatus*; and that not only, *ex eventu*, because it did not [take effect], but *ex naturâ rei*, because it could not take effect; such the real unreconcilableness betwixt us and Rome.

DR. HEYLIN.—I thought, that when our Saviour said, *Beati pacifici*, it had been sufficient warrant unto any man to endeavour peace, to build up the breaches in the church, and to make Jerusalem like “a city which is at unity in itself;” especially where it may be done, not only *salvâ charitate*, “without breach of charity,” but *salvâ fide* too, “without wrong to the faith.” The greatest part of the controversies betwixt us and the church of Rome not being in the fundamentals, or in any essential points in the Christian religion; I

cannot otherwise look upon it, but as a most Christian, pious work, to endeavour an at-onement \* in the superstructures. But hereof our author seems to doubt, First, whether such endeavours to agree and compose the differences, be *lawful* or not; and, Secondly, whether they be *possible*.

FULLER.—I confess scripture pronounceth the peacemakers “blessed,” Matt. v. 9. In answer whereunto, I will take no notice of Jehu’s tart return to king Joram: “What peace, so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many?” 2 Kings ix. 22. Rather will I make use of the calm counsel of the apostle: “If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, live peaceably with all men,” Rom. xii. 18. Which words (*if it be possible*) intimate *an impossibility of peace with some natures*, in some differences, though good men have done what lieth (understand it, lawfully) in their power to perform; such sometimes the *frowardness* of one (though the *forwardness* of the other) side to agreement: which is the true state of the controversy betwixt us and Rome.

317. DR. HEYLIN.—As for *the lawfulness* thereof, I could never see any reason produced against it, nor so much as any question made of it, till I found it here.

FULLER.—All such zealous authors who charge the papists with idolatry, (and the Animadvertor knows well who they are,) do question the lawfulness of such an agreement.

DR. HEYLIN.—Against *the possibility* thereof, it hath been objected, that such and so great is the pride of the church of Rome, that they will condescend to nothing. And, therefore, if any such composition or agreement be made, it must not be by their meeting us, but our going to them.

FULLER.—I remember, some (then present) have told me of a passage at a disputation in Oxford. When Dr. Prideaux pressed home an argument, to which the answerer† returned, *Reverende Professor, memini me legisse hoc ipsissimum argumentum apud Bellarminum*.—*At, mi fili*, returned that Doctor, *ubi legisti responsum?* This objection the Animadvertor acknowledgeth he hath formerly met with: but where did he meet with a satisfactory answer thereunto?

Let me add: it is not only the pride of the church of Rome, which will not let go her power; but also her covetousness, which will not part with her profit; which obstructeth all accommodation betwixt us. And if the *church* of Rome would, the *court* of Rome

\* See note, page 578.—EDIT.

† Mr. I. Sh.

will not, quit the premises ; and the latter hath an irresistible influence on the former. In this point, the *court* of Rome is like the countryman, who willingly put his cause to arbitration ; but on this condition,—to have all the land he sued for, with the full profits thereof to a minute past, and his own costs and charges to a farthing. Such and no other agreement will the court of Rome condescend unto.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, as our author saith, that many of the archbishop's "equals adjudged that design of his to be impossible ;" so I may say, (without making any such odious comparisons,) that many of our author's betters have thought otherwise of it.

FULLER.—Amongst which "many of his betters," the Animadver-  
tor undoubtedly is one of the principal. Be it so, I will endeavour to be as good I can, and will not envy but honour *my betters*, whose number God increase ! Sure I am, amongst these "many of my betters," the difference betwixt us and the papists is made never a whit the better, there remaining still μέγα χάσμα : and though many may manifest much good-will to advance, nothing hath taken effect to complete, such a composition.

DR. HEYLIN.—It was the petulancy of the Puritans on the one side, and the pragmatism of the Jesuits on the other side, which made the breach wider than it was at the first : and had these hot spirits on both sides been charmed a while, moderate men might possibly have agreed on such equal terms, as would have laid a sure foundation for the peace of Christendom.

FULLER.—Let us behold the original breach betwixt the church of Rome and us. I name the church of Rome first, because confident they caused it ; so that we may say unto them, *Pharez*, "The breach be upon them !" This breach was made before either Puritans or Jesuits ever appeared in England ; as the Animadver-  
tor, skilled in their dates, knoweth full well. It is therefore suspicious, that the wound which was made before these parties were in being will continue, if both of them were extinct.

I behold the College of Sorbonnists in Paris as far from Jesuitical pragmatism, and Dr. John Cosin as one free from Puritanical petulancy. Yet though the said Doctor hath complied with them so far as he could do with Christian prudence, *salvâ consci-  
entiâ* ; and though the Sorbonnists are beheld as the most learned and moderate papists ; yet I cannot hear of any accommodation betwixt them ; but rather the contrary, even in the point of the Apocrypha, (a controversy so learnedly canvassed by the Doctor,) they being as unwilling to allow *so few*, as he *so many*, books in the Bible to be canonical.



And here let me be the Animadvertor's remembrancer, (of what perchance he would willingly forget,) how it was not long since he twitted me for saying, that the difference about the posture of the communion-table might be accommodated with mutual moderation; and now he holdeth, by the same means an expedient betwixt us and the papists may be advanced.

DR. HEYLIN.—Moderate men might possibly have agreed on such equal terms, as would have laid a sure foundation for the peace of Christendom.

FULLER.—My name is Thomas. It maketh me the more distrust thereof, because I see at this day most cruel wars betwixt the Crowns of Spain and France, both which agree to the height in the same Romish religion. I am sorry their differences are paralleled with a sadder instance of the deadly wars betwixt the Swede and Dane, both Lutherans alike. And our sea-wars betwixt us and the Hollander (both well-paid for) are not yet forgotten. All I collect is this,—that if the agreement betwixt us and papists were expedited to-morrow, yet, so long as there be several greatnesses in Christendom, there will be justlings betwixt them. And although they are pleased to score their differences (for the greater credit) on the account of conscience and religion; yet what saith St. James? “From whence come wars and fightings amongst you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts, that war in your members?” James iv. 1. And it is a sad truth, such the corruption of human nature that men's lives and lusts will last and end together.

DR. HEYLIN.—Now that all these in the church of Rome are not so stiffly wedded to their own opinions as our author makes them, appears, First, by the testimony of the archbishop of Spalato, declaring in the High-Commission, a little before his going hence, that “he acknowledged the Articles of the church of England to be true, or profitable at the least, and none of them heretical.”

FULLER.—The Animadvertor hath instanced in an ill person, and in an ill time of the same person. It was just when he was a-taking his return to his vomit, and to leave the land; when, knowing himself obnoxious, and justly under the lash (for his covetous compliance with foreign invitations) of king James, to get leave to be gone, he would say any thing here, and unsay it again elsewhere. As little heed is to be given to such a Proteus, as hold is to be taken of him.

318. DR. HEYLIN.—It appears, Secondly, by a tractate of Franciscus de Sanctâ Clarâ, (as he calleth himself,) in which he putteth such a gloss upon the Nine-and-Thirty Articles of the church of England,

as rendereth them not inconsistent with the doctrines of the church of Rome.

FULLER.—By that parenthesis, “as he calleth himself,” it is left suspicious, that his true name was otherwise. And he who would not use his own but a false name might (for aught I know) put a false gloss upon our Articles; and though he *putteth* such a sense upon them, it is questionable whether our Articles will *accept* thereof. “To put something upon” sometimes answers to the Latin word *imponere*, which is “to deceive and delude,” and sometimes is equivalent to our English word “impose,” which soundeth “the forcible or fraudulent obtruding of a thing against the will and mind of him, or that, whereon it is imposed.” Lastly. The Animadvertor cannot warrant us, that the rest of the church of Rome will consent to the judgment of Franciscus de Sanctâ Clarâ; and if not, then is the breach betwixt us left as wide as it was before.

DR. HEYLIN.—And if without prejudice to the truth the controversies might have been composed, it is most probable that other protestant churches would have sued by their agents to be included in the peace.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor’s prudent and politic probability, that other protestant churches would, by their agents, solicit an inclusion into such a peace, mindeth me of the distich written on the sumptuous cradle, gorgeously trimmed for the child of queen Mary by Philip king of Spain :—

*Quam Mariæ sobolem, Deus Optime Summe, dedisti,  
Anglis incolumem redde, tuere, rege.*

“O may the child, to Mary God hath given,  
For England’s good be guarded safe by heaven.”

Whereas indeed this child, pretended at Whitehall, may be said born at Nonsuch, proving nothing but a mock-mother tympany.

I cannot but commend the kindness and care of the Animadvertor, for keeping this babe when born; I mean the agreement betwixt us and the papists. But let us behold it born, see it first effected; and then we shall know whether foreign protestant churches will dandle this infant, or destroy it; I mean, whether they will declare for, or protest and remonstrate against it. It will be time enough, then, for both our survivor to return an answer.

DR. HEYLIN.—If not, the church of England had lost nothing by it, as being hated by the Calvinists, and not loved by the Lutherans.

FULLER.—Short and sharp, much matter in few words, and little truth in much matter. Our church of England, in relation to foreign protestant churches, is here by the Animadvertor repre-

sented in a strange posture ; like another Ishmael, “ whose hand was against every one, and every one’s against him,” Gen. xvi. 22.

That our church is not hated by the Calvinists, appears by many and plain passages in the books of those who are *δοκοῦντες στύλοι*, “ seeming pillars,” amongst them,—Calvin, Beza, Zanchy, Deodat, Molinæus, &c. who (notwithstanding some small differences betwixt us) lovingly give us the right hand of fellowship.

The Animadvertor discovers himself as little statesman as divine in advising the church of England, by making foes of her friends, to make friends of her foes ; by incurring the enmity of foreign protestants, thereby to procure the amity of papists.

The best is, there is no danger to see that day. The poor woman in the Gospel was troubled with a double issue, the one of blood, the life in her body ; and the other of money, the life-blood of her estate ; but the latter was quickly stanchèd, “ having spent all her living on physicians to no purpose,” Luke viii. 43. Thus successful have their pains proved hitherto who have endeavoured an accommodation betwixt us and Rome ; so that the wound betwixt us may justly be beheld as incurable.

319. DR. HEYLIN.—But our author will not here desist, (so soon hath he forgotten his own rule made in the case of Mr. Love,) and therefore mustereth up his faults ; namely, 1. “ Passion,” though an “ human frailty.” 2. “ His severity to his predecessor, easing him, before his time, and against his will, of his jurisdiction.” 3. “ His over-meddling in state-matters.” 4. “ His imposing of the Scottish Liturgy.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 474.) Of all which we have spoken so much upon other occasions, that is to say, numbers 246, 251, 289, 259 ; (pages 572, 580, 587, 611 ; ) and therefore do not count it necessary to add any thing here.

FULLER.—I shall, God willing, remember and practise my rule in the case of Mr. Love, when the Animadvertor (I fear) will be found to have forgotten it. Here are four faults of the archbishop mustered up by me ; and is it not a thin muster indeed ? When a gentleman was told, that he would be much ashamed if all his faults were written in his forehead ; he (in my mind) modestly and wittily replied, *that he should be right glad that his face could hold them all !* Happy is that man whose faults may be reduced to the number of four !

I have, in my reply to the fore-cited pages of the Animadvertor, returned my answer unto them ; and therefore, to use his language, “ account it unnecessary to add any thing here.”

I have done no wrong to the archbishop’s memory, if I have charged him with four faults, and, to overpoise them, have given him many commendations, in several places of my book ; which

here I will sum up to confute that loud and late untruth of the Animadvertor, when saying, (page 580,) "Our author gives us nothing of this prelate but his wants and weaknesses."

The praise I gave him is reducible to four heads: **NATURALS** or Corporals, about his body or person; **MORALS** or Civils, touching his demeanour to others; **INTELLECTUALS**, whether innate, or acquiste by his own industry; **SPIRITUALS** or Supernaturals, to which his benefactions (as the fruit of a lively faith) are reduced.

All these quotations are taken out of the eleventh book of my Church History:—

**NATURALS.**—1. Nephew to a Lord Mayor of London, therefore not basely born. (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 472.) 2. "Cheerful in countenance." (*Idem*, p. 477.) 3. "A sharp and piercing eye." (*Ibidem*.) 4. "Gravity and quickness were well-compounded in his face." (*Ibidem*.) 5. "So cheerful his countenance, (when ascending the scaffold,) as rather to gain a crown, than lose his head." (*Idem*, p. 471.)

**MORALS.**—6. "He was temperate in his diet." (*Idem*, p. 475.) 7. "Chaste in his conversation." (*Ibid.*) 8. "Plain in his apparel." (*Ibid.*) 9. "Not preferring his own kindred without merit." (*Idem*, p. 476.) 10. "Promoting men of learning and abilities." (*Ibid.*) 11. "Covetousness he perfectly hated." (*Ibid.*) 12. "Had no project to raise a name or family." (*Ibid.*) 13. "Abridged courtiers' bribes." (*Idem*, p. 475.) 14. "But not their fees for church-preferments." (*Ibid.*) 15. "Not ambitious, as appears by his refusing a cardinal's cap once and again offered him." (*Idem*, p. 380.)

**INTELLECTUALS.**—16. "He had a clear judgment." (*Idem*, p. 477.) 17. "Of a firm memory." (*Ibid.*) 18. "One of the greatest scholars of our nation." (*Idem*, p. 472.) 19. "Having an experimental knowledge of all conditions of clergymen." (*Idem*, p. 473.)

**SPIRITUALS.**—20. "A strict observer of the Lord's day in his own person." (*Idem*, p. 377.) 21. "Moderate in pressing the Book of Sports in his own diocess." (*Idem*, p. 378.) 22. "A worthy instrument in moving king Charles to so pious a work as the restoring of the Irish impropriations." (*Idem*, p. 379.)

Thus I did write in his due praise as much as I durst; and though less than his friends expected, more than I am thanked for. All I will add is this: Seeing his head was cut off by the axe, it had been madness in me to run my neck into the halter, in taxing those of cruelty and injustice who caused his execution.

**DR. HEYLIN.**—And so I leave him to his rest, in the bosom of Abraham, in the land of the living.

FULLER.—“Bosom of Abraham” is a scripture-expression, to signify the repose of the souls of such saints who departed this life before the ascension of our Saviour into heaven. Wherever “the bosom of Abraham” be, it is good to be there; and hence it is frequently used by the Fathers to denote the happy condition even of such who departed in the faith since Christ’s ascension. *Quicquid illud est, saith St. Augustine, quod illo significatur sinu, ibi Nebridius meus vivit, dulcis amicus meus.\** For the main, it is a synonymon with heaven, and probably all the persons therein are receptive of a higher degree of glory after the day of judgment.

“Land of the living” is an Old-Testament phrase; which some narrow-breasted commentators have confined to temporal happiness, but importeth much more, in my opinion, even final felicity; as may appear by David’s expression: “I had fainted unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord *in the land of the living,*” Psalm xxvii. 13.

I have staid the longer in the stating of these two expressions, that I may the more safely and sincerely concur, as I do, with the Animadvertor’s charity in the final estate of this prelate: with whose memory my pen here makes no truce, but a perfect peace, never hereafter to let the least disgraceful drop of ink to fall upon it.

DR. HEYLIN.—From the archbishop of Canterbury, I should proceed to Dr. Williams, archbishop of York; but that I must first remove a block which lies in my way. Our author, having told us of the making and printing the Directory, is not content to let us see the cold entertainment which it found when it came abroad, but lets us see it in such terms as we did not look for.

FULLER.—This block is no bigger than a straw, so that a flea may leap over it: but the Animadvertor is pleased to see all things through a magnifying glass, as will appear hereafter.

320. DR. HEYLIN.—“Such,” saith he, “was, call it constancy or obstinacy, love or doting, of the generality of the nation, on the Common Prayer, that the Parliament found it fit, yea, necessary, to back their former Ordinance with a second.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 481.) Assuredly, “the generality of the people of England” is much behold-ing to our author, for making question, whether their adhering to the Liturgy, then by law established, were not to be imputed rather to “obstinacy and doting,” than to “love and constancy.”

FULLER.—It is no question *in my judgment or conscience* when it is out of all question, as either never started or soon decided

\* *Confessiones*, lib. ix. cap. 3.

therein ; but a question it is *in the practice of our distracted age*, which I behold like the city of Ephesus : “ Some cried one thing, some another, for the assembly was confused,” Acts xix. 32. Till this tumult be appeased, I desire to stand by in silence, and give every man his own words. Some call “ constancy and love,” which side I do seem secretly to favour, for giving it the upper hand, and naming it in the first place. Others call it “ obstinacy and doting,” as they are severally persuaded. What is my offence, or where is the block the Animadvertor complaineth of, as if he needed to call for levers to remove it ?

321. DR. HEYLIN.—The Liturgy had been looked on as a great blessing of God upon this nation, by “ the generality of people,” for the space of fourscore years and upwards ; they found it established by the law, sealed by the blood of those that made it, confirmed by many godly and religious princes ; and had almost no other form of making their ordinary addresses to Almighty God, but what was taught them in the Book of Common Prayer. And could any discreet man think, or wise man hope, that a Form of Prayer, so universally received, and so much esteemed, could be laid by without reluctance in those who had been so long accustomed to it ? or called “ obstinacy or doting” in them, if they did not presently submit to every new nothing, which, in the name of the then-disputable authority, should be laid before them ! And though our author doth profess, that, in the agitating of this controversy *pro* and *con*, he will reserve his private opinion to himself ; yet he discovers it too plainly in the present passage. *Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam ?* is a good rule here. He must needs show his private opinion in this point, (say he what he can,) who makes a question, whether the adhesion of the people generally to the public Liturgy were built on “ obstinacy and doting,” or on “ love and constancy.”

FULLER.—I concur with the Animadvertor in his encomiastic expressions on the Common Prayer. Otherwise, nothing new occurs in this, which was not in the former paragraph. And, therefore, the blow being the same, (only laid on with a little more eagerness,) I conceive the same guard will serve to defend it, without any further repetition.

DR. HEYLIN.—But, if it must be “ obstinacy or doting in the generality of people,” to adhere so cordially unto the Book of Common Prayer, I marvel what it must be called in Stephen Marshall of Essex, (that great bell-wether, for a time, of the Presbyterians,) who, having had a chief hand in compiling the Directory, did, notwithstanding, marry his own daughter by the form prescribed in the Common-Prayer Book ; and, having so done, paid down five pounds immediately to the churchwardens of the parish, as the fine or forfeiture for using any other form of marriage than that of the Directory. The

like to which (I have credibly been informed) was done by Mr. Knightly of Fawsley, on the like occasion, and probably by many others of the same strain also.

FULLER.—All this is nothing to me, who am not bound to answer for the actions of other men. I know there was in England a juncture of time, which in this point may be compared to the evening twilight; so called from *twalight*, or “double light,”—the one of the day not wholly gone down, the other of the candle but newly set up. Such the *crepusculum vespertinum* in our land, when the day of the Liturgy yet dimly shined, and the candle of the Directory was also lighted; a short candle, which presently burnt down to the socket. It is possible, that, in this co-incidence, some, in *majorem cautelam*, twisted the Liturgy and Directory together, as since some have joined to both, marriage by a Justice of Peace; that so a threefold cable might not be broken. Let them which best can, give an account of their own carriage herein.

DR. HEYLIN.—With the like favour he beholds the two Universities, as he does the Liturgy; and hard it is to say which he injureth most.

FULLER.—I injure neither of them. But in this passage, the Animadvertor only whets his sword, and I scour my shield, preparing against his deadly blow in the next paragraph.

322. DR. HEYLIN.—And, First, beginning with Oxford, he lets us know, that “lately certain delegates from the University of Oxford pleaded their privileges before the Committee of Parliament, that they were only visitable by the king, and such who should be deputed by him. But their allegations were not of proof against the paramount power of Parliament; the rather because a passage in an article at the rendition of Oxford was urged against them, wherein they were subjected to such a visitation.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 493, 494.) Our author here subjects the University of Oxford to the power of the Parliament, and that not only in regard of that paramount power which he ascribes unto the Parliament, that is to say, the two Houses of Parliament, (for so we are to understand him,) above all Estates; but also in regard of “an article concerning the surrendry of Oxford, by which that University was subjected to such visitations.”

FULLER.—When I see a corslet shot through with a musket-bullet, and the person wounded that wore it, I may safely say, that corslet is not of proof against the musket. So when I behold the pleadings of the Delegates neglected and nulled, I may say, that *de facto* they were not of proof against parliamentary power. A passage possibly written by me, (such my affection to my aunt Oxford,) with more *grief* than it is read by the Animadvertor with *anger*;



but truth is truth, whether it be written by one sighing or singing ; read " by one smiling or frowning."

The reader needs no interpreter to expound the word " Parliament," as taken generally, at this time, (success having beaten the sense thereof into men's heads,) for " the two Houses." *Loqui cum vulgo* in this case, I hope is no fault. These " two Houses " at this time maintained their *enthymeme* to be a complete *sylllogism*, concluding all persons under them ; presuming that the king, though not personally, was virtually with them : a position which I have no calling to examine. As for the clause in the article which hooked the University under parliamentary visitation, hear how the Animad-vertor reports it.

DR. HEYLIN.—I find, indeed, that it was agreed on by the Commissioners on both sides touching the surrendry of that city : " That the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Oxon, and the Governors and Students of Christ-church of king Henry the eighth's foundation, and all other Heads and Governors, Masters, Fellows, and Scholars of the Colleges, Halls, and bodies corporate, and societies of the same University, and the public Professors and Readers, and the Orator thereof, and all other persons belonging to the said University, or to any Colleges or Halls therein, shall and may, according to their statutes, charters, and customs, enjoy their ancient form of government, subordinate to the immediate authority and power of Parliament." \* But I find not, that any of the Heads or Delegates of that University were present at the making of this article, or consented to it, or thought themselves obliged by any thing contained in it.

FULLER.—This last clause was eagerly urged by the Committee against the Delegates of the University; and I could wish they could as easily have untied the knot, as answered the hardest objection of Bellarmine in the Divinity-Schools. The king, when privately departing Oxford, left, if not a Commission, at least leave, with the Lords, to make as good terms for themselves, and all with them in the city besieged, as the enemy would give, and they could get, in that straitened condition. The University therefore was urged by the Committee to have given an implicit consent to these Articles ; and, enjoying the benefit, they must share in the burden thereof. To this the Delegates made many fair and civil answers, strengthened with law and reason : but, alas ! great are the odds, though learning be the Answerer, where power is the Opponent.

DR. HEYLIN.—Nor indeed could it stand with reason, that they should wave the patronage of a gracious sovereign, who had been " a nursing father " to them, and put themselves under the arbitrary power

of those who they knew minded nothing but destruction toward them. And that the University did not think itself obliged by any thing contained in that article, appears even by our author himself, who tells us in this very passage, that "the Delegates from the University pleaded their privileges before the Committee of Parliament, that they were only visitable by the king, and such as should be deputed by him;" which certainly they had never done, (unless our author will conclude them to be fools or madmen,) had they before submitted to that "paramount power" which he ascribes unto the Houses. Nor did the Houses of Parliament find themselves empowered, by this clause of the article, to obtrude any such visitation on them. And therefore when the Delegates had pleaded and proved their privileges, a Commission for a visitation was issued by the two Houses of Parliament in the name of the king, but under the new Broad Seal which themselves had made; which notwithstanding, the University stood still on their own defence, in regard that though the king's name was used in that Commission, yet they knew well, that he had never given his consent unto it. Whereupon followed that great alteration both in the Heads and Members of most Colleges which our author speaks of.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor endeavours to run me on one of these dangerous rocks,—either to condemn the University for fools and madmen, whom I love and honour for wise and sober persons; or else to make me incur the displeasure of the Parliament. And the philosopher's answer to the emperor is well known: "That it is ill disputing with them that can command legions." The best is, I am not bound to answer to this dangerous dilemma, keeping myself close to my calling; namely, reporting what was done,—but whether justly or unjustly, let others decide.

The Animadvertor's boldness herein is for me to admire, not imitate. When an old man was demanded the cause of his confidence, how he durst so freely tell a king of his faults, he rendered a double reason of his boldness,—*orbitas et senectus*; one, *that he had no children*, and, therefore, careless to preserve posterity; the other, *that he was extremely old*, therefore, less curious to keep that life that was leaving him.

How it fareth with the Animadvertor in these two particulars, I know not; sure I am for myself, that I am not so old to be weary of the world, as I hope it is not of me; and, God having given me children, I will not destroy them, and hazard myself, by running into needless dangers. And let this suffice for an answer.

323. DR. HEYLIN.—Nor deals he much more candidly in relating the proceedings of the Visitation which was made in Cambridge; the Visitors whereof (as acting "by the paramount power of Parliament") he more sensibly favoureth than the poor sufferers, or "malignant members," as he calls them, of that University.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor sees more in me than I can see in myself; and because we are both parties engaged, (the less to be credited in our own cause,) be it reported to the reader, if pleased to peruse the conclusion of my “History of Cambridge,” whether I cast not my grains of favour into the scales of the poor sufferers. These I call not “malignant members,” but with this qualification, “so termed.”\* And let not me be condemned for the ill language of others.

I say again, As (as an Historian) I have favoured no side, but told the truth; so I could not so far unman myself, but that, for humanity’s sake, (to say no more,) I did pity the sufferers; on which account I incurred the displeasure of the opposite party. The best is, causeless anger, being an edgeless sword, I fear it the less.

DR. HEYLIN.—For whereas the author of the book called *Querela Cantabrigiensis* hath told us of “an oath of discovery,” obtruded by the Visitors upon several persons, whereby they were sworn to detect one another, even their dearest friends; our author, who was out of the storm, seeming not satisfied in the truth of this relation, must write to Mr. Ash, who was one of those Visitors, to be informed in that which he knew before.†

FULLER.—No person more proper or probable to inform me herein than Mr. Ash, one of the Visitors; who, I believed, did both know the truth, and would not tell a falsehood herein. I was so far from desiring information in what (as the Animadvertor saith) I “knew before,” that I protest *I know it not yet*, being left in such a mist about this “oath of discovery.”

On the one side, my worthy friend, Mr. Peter Gunning, Fellow of Clare-Hall, (eminent for his learning and honesty,) hath since assured me that such an oath was offered and urged upon him by the Committee. On the other side, I am, on just grounds, daily confirmed in my confidence, that neither the earl of Manchester, nor any under him, by his command or consent, enforced such an oath. So that where to lay the blame, I know not; and have neither list nor leisure further to inquire; who, having blistered my fingers already, will burn my hands no more in so dangerous a subject. Our author proceeds:—

DR. HEYLIN.—And, on the reading of Mr. Ash’s answer, declares expressly, that “no such oath was tendered by him to that University.” But, First, Mr. Ash doth not absolutely deny that there was any such oath, but [says] that he was “a stranger to it:” and possibly

\* “History of Cambridge,” page 235.

† *Idem, ibidem.*

he might be so far a stranger to it as not to be an actor in that part of the tragedy. Secondly. Mr. Ash only saith, that he "cannot call to mind that any such thing was moved by the earl of Manchester;" and yet, I trow, such a thing might be moved by the earl of Manchester, though Mr. Ash, after so many years, was willing not to call it to mind. Or else, if no such oath was tendered by him, as our author is assured there was not, that part of the tragedy might be acted by Mr. Good, the other chaplain, without communicating his instructions to his Fellow-Visitor.

FULLER.—Mr. Ash, on serious and solemn recollection, hath since given me assurance, both by his word of mouth and writing, that no such oath was urged, to his knowledge; and, being a minister of the gospel, I am, in charity and conscience, bound to believe him.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, therefore, Thirdly, I would know why Mr. Good was not writ to also, that, having from him the like certificate, our author might have had the better grounds for his unbelief, before he had pronounced so positively against the author of that *Querela*.

FULLER.—The reason was, because Mr. Good was dead, and (had I known whither) I did not know by what carrier to convey my letter unto him. I pronounced not positively against *Querela*, in point of the oath, which I left under very vehement suspicions.

DR. HEYLIN.—Fourthly, and finally. It is not easy to be thought, that the author of that book should have vented such a manifest falsehood, especially in a matter so derogatory to all Christian charity; and that neither the earl of Manchester, nor either of his two chaplains, or any friends of theirs, should, in the space of ten years and more, endeavour to wipe off such an odious imputation, till our author, out of pure zeal to "the paramount power," played the advocate in it.

FULLER.—I will freely give all my fees, for my advocacy, to the Animadvertor; and will thank him too, if he will be pleased to take them from me to himself. It seems, I did not my work well, who had nothing but displeasure for my wages.

Possibly the earl of Manchester might not know, that the urging of such an oath was objected against him and his; and probably, if he did know, he satisfied himself in his own integrity and innocence, leaving the blame and shame to fall on such as were guilty thereof.

324. DR. HEYLIN.—But to return again to Oxford: One of the first effects which followed on the alteration before remembered, (though mentioned by our author in another place,) was the rifling of the treasury in Magdalen-College, of which he tells us, that "a con-

siderable sum of gold, being by Dr. Humphrey " (who had been Master of that College) " left in a chest, not to be opened, except some great necessity urged thereunto, was lately shared between Dr. Wilkinson " (who then held the place of President by the power of the Visitors) " and the Fellows there." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 253.) But, First, our author is mistaken in Dr. Humphrey, though he be willing to entitle him (whom he calls " a moderate Nonconformist ") to some benefaction. The sum there found amounted to above twelve hundred double pistolets, the old Doctor having no fewer than one hundred for his part of the spoil, and every Fellow thirty a-piece for theirs; each pistolet exchanged at sixteen shillings six pence, and yet the exchanger got well by the bargain too. Too great a sum for Dr. Humphrey, (who had many children, and no provident woman to his wife,) to leave behind him to the College, had he been so minded. The money (as the tradition went in that College) was left there by the Founder, to remedy and repair such ruins as either the casualty of fire, or the ravages of a civil war, might bring upon it; to which the nature of the coin, being all French pieces, (remember that the English at that time were masters of a great part of France,) gives a further testimony.

FULLER.—As I have been mistaken in the person, Dr. Humphrey, for bishop Wainfleet, donor of this gold, (following common report therein,) so I could heartily have wished I had also erred in the thing itself; I mean, that an amotion of such devoted treasure had never been done.

The Animadvertor might well have forborne his sparring at the precious memory of that learned and pious Dr. Humphrey. And the new mention of his name mindeth me of an old fault, which the Animadvertor not long since laid to my charge; namely, my calling of Thomas Bentham, (*the Dean*, saith he, of Magdalen's, Oxford,) *the Censor* thereof. Whereas I exactly followed the words of Dr. Humphrey, in his Latin " Life of Jewel," page 73: *Thomas Benthamus, quamvis CENSOR, eo anno, &c.* And I humbly conceive, that I, having so good a *precedent* as Dr. Humphrey, *president* of that College, I might as well call their dean, *censor* in English, as he doth in Latin.

DR. HEYLIN.—Secondly. I would have our author observe, that those whom he accuseth of this act of rapine were neither " high royalists," nor " covetous conformists," as we know who words it; but men agreeable to the times, and of the same temper and affections which himself is of: " the conformists " never being so " covetous " as to cast an eye towards it, nor the " high royalists " so ignoble in their greatest extremities as to lay hands on it.

FULLER.—If I be one of their persuasion who shared this gold, (and I must be so because the Animadvertor doth say it,) I have

acquitted myself a faithful historian, in not consulting my own party's credit; but unpartially reporting the truth. However, I hope God will keep my hands, that my fingers shall not have the GUILT of the gold of Tholouse.

DR. HEYLIN.—And, Thirdly, I must needs charge our author with some partiality in aggravating this fact (which indeed cannot be excused) with so many circumstances, and passing over the like at Cambridge, as a thing incredible. “I cannot believe,” saith he, (*Hist. of Cambridge*, p. 61,) “what I have read in the *Querela Cantabrigiensis*, that three or four hundred pounds' worth of timber, brought to Clare-Hall, for the repair of that House, was lately taken away;” that is to say, inverted to the use of some private persons, whom our author hath befriended with this incredulity.

FULLER.—I did not aggravate the fact, nor heavily lean on my pen in relating this passage, nor laid more weight thereon than merely to make it cast ink. The Animadvertor hath more bitterness wrapped up in this one word “rapine,” than I have stretched out in all my relation of this accident.

DR. HEYLIN.—Nay, so extremely favourable he is to his friends in Cambridge as to profess, that, “had he seen it, he would not have believed his own eyes;” which is the highest point of partiality and most invincible unbelief that I ever met with.

FULLER.—Herein the Animadvertor is highly just (to say no more) unto me. Is it not cruelty to such as write in distracted times, and are as desirous to impart dangerous truths to posterity, so also to secure themselves, (as who can blame them?) as well as they may, to hunt them out of the covert of any figurative or wary expression? But “none so deaf as he who will not hear;” I mean, as to understand. The Animadvertor knew my expression pointed at some too high for me safely to reach.

Know, reader, that what need (as pleaded) in time of war took from Clare-Hall, that conscience in the same person hath since restored to the full; as Dr. Dillingham, my worthy friend, and Master of the College, hath informed me. Now, though Oxford challengeth antiquity to go before Cambridge, yet herein let her not disdain to come after her, and to follow so good an example of restitution: for though I have heard, and partly believe, that Dr. Wilkinson did with might and main oppose the seizure on that gold; and though they say it appeared, when seriously examined by the Visitors, that it was not so foul a fact as generally it is represented; yet it cannot in all particulars be excused, and therein I concur with the Animadvertor. So that Jacob's counsel to his

sons may here be seasonably prescribed : “ Carry the money back again, peradventure it was an oversight,” Gen. xliii. 12.

DR. HEYLIN.—There remains nothing now to conclude these Animadversions, but some passages relating to archbishop Williams: in which I must confess myself not willing to meddle, but that I think it is as much against the rule of distributive justice to give one man too much, as to give another man too little. Let us see therefore what he saith of this prelate, and how far he saith truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. And first, saith he,—

FULLER.—The truth hereof will soon appear by the sequel. For if the Animadvertor shall inflame his smoking faults, hollow in the ears of every dormant suspicion, to awaken it against the memory of this prelate, yea, and hang the weight of his greatest guiltiness on the wires of the slenderest proof; then, notwithstanding this his plausibility to the contrary premised, he will plainly appear to have a pike (the sharpness whereof his death hath not blunted) against him.

When one was to preach the funeral sermon of a most vicious and generally-hated person, all wondered what he would say in his praise; the preacher’s friends fearing—his foes hoping—that, for his fee, he would force his conscience to flattery. “ For one thing,” said the minister, “ this man is to be spoken well of by all; and for another thing he is to be spoken ill of by none. The first is, Because God made him; the second, Because he is dead.”

Now, seeing, besides the premisses common to all Christians, yea, to all men, many worthy works have been done by the bishop; and especially, seeing known animosities were betwixt him and the Animadvertor, (which with ingenuity is an *ὕπερ*-super-over-commanding motive to silence,) the Animadvertor had better have forborne all which followeth, in my judgment, and in the judgment of as many “ learned and religious men, of all orders and degrees in both Universities,” as ever solicited him to write against my Church-History.

325, 326. DR. HEYLIN.—“ He sueth to the Parliament for favour, and obtained it; whose general in a manner he becomes in laying siege to the town and castle of Aberconway,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 487.) This is the truth; but whether it be the whole truth or not, I do more than doubt. His “ suing for and obtaining pardon from the Parliament” precedeth, in the order of time, his being their general; and therefore it is not to be thought but that he had done some special service to the Parliament to prepare the way for such a favour. Before his commitment to the Tower about the bishops’ protestation, he was grown as odious to the Commons, as before he had been honoured by



them. He had lived some time with the king at Oxford, and is said to have done him good services in Wales; and (which is most) he had a fair temporal estate, able to yield some thousands of pounds for composition in Goldsmiths' Hall. So that there must be somewhat in it more than ordinary, which occasioned that he neither came under fine nor ransom, as the rest of the king's party did. But what that was, whether he served them with intelligence when he was at Oxford, or by inhibiting his tenants and neighbours to pay their accustomed taxes to the king's forces when he lived in Wales, I determine not. Certain it is, that before his redintegration with them, he had been in a manner besieged in his house of Penryn by the lord Byron, for the prohibiting of sending-in such provisions as had been required; and that, observing with what carelessness the king's soldiers did attend that service, he caused a sally to be made out of the house, and slew many of them. Upon the merit of which service, and the promise of greater, it is no wonder if such ministers and solicitors of his as were employed in that business, compounded for him without fine, though not without money. That which our author tells us of his being their general, seems to have been fore-signified some five or six years before the siege of Conway Castle. For I remember, that, about such time as he was prisoner in the Tower with the rest of the bishops, his picture was sold commonly in black and white, in his episcopal robes, with a square cap on his head, a rest in his hand, a musket on his shoulder, and a bandelier about his neck. For which fancy at that time I could learn no reason, though he came up to it at the last.

FULLER.—This is not contradictory, but additory, to what I have written; an additory only of suggestions and suspicions, no probations; the Animadvertor's arrow coming off without a pile, when he saith, "*I determine not.*" I had thought, when this *Doctor Cathedræ* (for historical matters) had so solemnly settled himself in the chair, that we should have heard from him some solid *determination*, which belike he dares not do: and, in my opinion, it had been more consonant to Christian charity, not to have discussed what he could not decide; seeing matters of this nature are to be hunted down, or else it is best they be never started. Is this he who so lately professed his averseness to meddle with this archbishop, and is now so ready to run out against him on all occasions when he hardly hath half an errand? and rather *would* than *can* produce any certainty in his suggestions?

327. DR. HEYLIN.—But he goes on: "He was very chaste in his conversation." (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 488.) And I hope so too, notwithstanding the scandalous reports of Weldon, the nameless author aimed at, (in the following words,) in his pamphlet called "the Court of King James," and some vulgar fables or hearsays too much credited

by a late Historian.\* But I must needs say, that I am not satisfied in the arguments which are brought to prove it. Wilson, in his unworthy "History of the Reign of King James," makes him to be *eunuchus ab utero*, "an eunuch from his mother's womb." The author of the pamphlet, called "the Observator observed," conceives that Wilson went too far in this expression, and rather thinks, "that he contracted some impotency by falling on a stake when he was a boy." (Fol. 10.) Our author here seems to incline unto this last, assuring us from such "who knew the privacies and casualties of his infancy, that this archbishop was but one degree removed from a misogynist, though, to palliate his infirmity to noble females, he was most complete in his courtly addresses." But, First, the falsity and frivolousness of these defences leave the poor man under a worse suspicion than they found him in. His manly countenance, together with his masculine voice, showed plainly that he was no eunuch; and the agreeableness of his conversation with the female sex did as plainly show, that he was no misogynist, or "woman-hater." And, Secondly, admitting these surmises to be true and real, they rather serve to evidence his impotency than to prove his chastity; it being no chastity in that man to abstain from women, who, either by casualty or by nature, is disabled from such copulations. The virtue of chastity consisteth rather in the integrity of the soul, than the mutilation of the body; and therefore more to be ascribed to those pious men, *qui salvis oculis feminam vident*, in Tertullian's language, *animo adversus libidinem cæco*, than to the old philosopher, who put out his eyes to avoid temptations of that nature.† So that if this be all which they have to say for the bishop's chastity, these advocates had showed more wisdom in saying nothing, than speaking so little to the purpose.

FULLER.—I am sorry to see the memory of this bishop, since his decease, to fall on a sharper stake than his body did in his infancy, even the pen of the Animadvertor. I confess, chastity cannot necessarily be concluded from natural debility, or casual impotency; there being a possibility of a frying heart in a freezing body. And we know who hath written, *Ut eunuchus qui amplectitur virginem et gemit*, Ecclus. xxx. 20.

The casualty of his infancy was by me mentioned, and cast in as *super-pondium*, or "over-weight," to confirm such as were persuaded before in his chastity, which was never called into question by any person of credit. As for *aulicus e coquina*, "the courtier out of the kitchen," pretending himself such a master of defence in all court-controversies, such as have perused his book will find cause to say of him, *Expectavi lanistam; inveni scurram, rabulam, lixam*.

The conversableness of this bishop with women consisted chiefly (if not only) in his treatments of great ladies and persons of

\* "History of King Charles," fol. 21.

† *Apologia*, c. 21.

honour; wherein he did personate the completeness of courtesy to that sex. otherwise, a woman was seldom to be seen in his house. Hence it was, that the palace of this prelate had more magnificence than neatness therein, sometimes defective in the punctilios and niceties of daintiness, lying lower than masculine cognizance, and as level to a woman's eye to espy, as easy for her hand to amend. Our author proceeds :—

328. DR. HEYLIN.—“ Envy itself cannot deny, but that, whithersoever he went, he might be traced by the footsteps of his benefaction.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 488.) Amongst which benefactions it was none of the least, that in both the Universities he had so many Pensioners; more (as it was commonly given out) than all the noblemen and bishops in the land together: some of which received twenty nobles, some ten pounds, and other twenty marks, *per annum*. And yet it may be said, without envy, that none of all these pensions came out of his own purse, but were laid as rent-charges upon such benefices as were in his disposing, either as Lord-Keeper or bishop of Lincoln, and assigned over to such scholars in each University as applied themselves to him. And because I would not be thought to say this without book, I have both seen and had in my keeping, till of late, (if I have it not still,) an acquittance made unto a minister in discharge of the payment of a pension of twenty nobles *per annum*, to one who was then a Student in Christ Church. The names of the parties I forbear; he that received it, and he for whom it was received, (and perhaps he that paid it too,) being still alive. And possible enough it is, that this pensioning of so many Scholars had not been passed over in silence by our author, if he had not known *the whole truth* as well as *the truth*.

FULLER.—His pensioning so many scholars soundeth more to his credit, than the paucity of their pensioners to the honour of other lords and bishops. It was impossible that so numerous pensions could all issue out of his own purse, without great impairing of his estate; and therefore no wonder if he was not the *giver*, but the bare *disposer*, of some of them to promising pregnancies, where worth and want did meet together in the same person. And though such payments were not costly to the bishop, they were no less comfortable to such as received them; it being all one with the parched ground, whether the water-pot which besprinkleth it be filled from the spring, or from the river. This was done by him without any appearance of evil, with the free and full consent of such incumbents as he presented, far from the shadow of simoniacal compliance; seeing, besides the Statute to this purpose, in the reign of king Henry VIII. the Injunctions of queen Elizabeth do countenance a bishop's assigning five pounds annually, out of every

hundred pounds of a benefice, to such uses. As for many of the pensions he paid, I am since as well assured they were expended out of his own purse, as I am confident the causeless cavils in our Animadvertor's book were bred in his own brains, without any other's suggesting them unto him.

329, 330. DR. HEYLIN.—“Much he expended on the repair of Westminster Abbey Church,” &c. “The library at Westminster was the effect of his bounty.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 488.) This though it be true in part, yet we cannot say of it, that it is either “the whole truth,” or “nothing but the truth.” For the plain truth is, that neither the charge of repairing that church, nor furnishing that library, came out of his own private coffers, but the church's rents. For, at such time as he was made Lord-Keeper of the Great Seal, he caused it to be signified unto the prebendaries of that church, how inconvenient it would be both to him and them to keep up the Commons of the College; and gained so far upon them, that they passed over to him all the rents of that church, upon condition that he should pay the annual pensions of the prebendaries, schoolmasters, choir-men, and inferior officers, and maintain the Commons of the Scholars. The rest, amounting to a great yearly value, was left wholly to him, upon his honourable word and promise to expend the same for the good and honour of that church. The surplusage of which expenses received by him for four years and upwards, amounted unto more than had been laid out by him on the church and library; as was offered to be proved before the Lords Commissioners at the visitation, *anno* 1635. And as for the library at St. John's, it might possibly cost him more wit than money; many books being daily sent in to him, (upon the intimation of his purpose of founding the two libraries,) by such as had either suits in Court, or business in Chancery, or any ways depended on him, or expected any favours from him, either as bishop of Lincoln, or dean of Westminster.

FULLER.—As the worm on a sudden smote the gourd of Jonah, and it withered; so it is possible, that the most verdant and flourishing charity may be fretted and blasted by ill reports.

There is a chapter-act subscribed with the hands of the prebendaries of Westminster, (the date whereof I do not at present remember,) and the copy of it is in the hands of my worthy friend, wherein they thankfully acknowledge the great bounty of this bishop, in expending so much on the repair of their church.

If the “library of St. John's cost him more wit than money,” (as the Animadvertor phraseth it,) sure I am that, in the same sense, the founding of Fellowships and Scholarships in that College, cost him more money than wit. Our author proceeds:—

331. DR. HEYLIN.—“He hated popery with a perfect hatred.”

(Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 489.) But Wilson, in his "History of Great Britain," sings another song, whether in tune, or out of tune, they can best tell who lived most near those times, and had opportunities to observe him.

FULLER.—I wonder that the Animadvertor, who, in the preface to this his book, had branded WILSON'S "History" with the name of a "most infamous pasquil," maketh mention of any passage therein to a bishop's disgrace.

DR. HEYLIN.—There is a muttering of some strange offer which he made to king James, at such time as the prince was in Spain, and the Court seemed in common apprehension to warp towards popery, which declared no such perfect hatred (as our author speaks of) unto that religion.

FULLER.—The prophet telleth us of tongues which have muttered perverseness, Isaiah lvi. 3; and such to me seem they that are authors of this report.

332. DR. HEYLIN.—Nor was he coy of telling such whom he admitted unto privacies with him, that, in the time of his greatness at Court, he was accounted for the head of the catholic party, not sparing to declare what free and frequent accesses he gave the principal sticklers in that cause, both priests and Jesuits, and the special services which he did them. And it must be somewhat more than strange, if all this be true, that he should "hate popery with a perfect hatred;" yet not more strange than that he should so stickle in the preferment of Dr. Theodore Price to the archbishopric of Armagh in Ireland, "who died a professed catholic, reconciled to the church of Rome," as our author hath it, Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 486. But if there be no more truth in the bishop of Lincoln's "hating popery," than in Dr. Price's "dying a professed papist," there is no credit to be given at all to that part of the character. Dr. Price, though once a great favourite of this bishop, and by him continued sub-dean of Westminster many years together, was at the last supposed to be better affected to bishop Laud, than to bishop Williams; bishop Laud having lately appeared a suitor for him for the bishopric of St. Asaph. And therefore, that two birds might be killed with the same bolt, no sooner was Dr. Price deceased, but the bishop of Lincoln, being then at Westminster, calls the prebends together; tells them that he had been with Mr. Sub-Dean before his death; that he left him in very doubtful terms about religion, and consequently could not tell in what form to bury him; that if the doctor had died a professed papist, he would have buried him himself; but, being as it was, he could not see how any of the prebendaries could either with safety or with credit perform that office. But the artifice and design, being soon discovered, took so little effect that Dr. Newel, one of the senior prebendaries, performed

the obsequies, the rest of the whole Chapter attending the body to the grave, with all due solemnity.

FULLER.—I deny not but, as a statesman, he might do some civil offices to the Romish party in that juncture of time, in compliance to king James's commands. But this amounteth not to prove him a lover of popery.

As for Dr. Price, I will not rake into his ashes. If he died a protestant, it was the better for him; but the contrary is generally reported, printed, believed. Our author proceeds:—

333. DR. HEYLIN.—“He was so great an honourer of the English Liturgy, that of his own cost he caused the same to be translated into Spanish, and fairly printed, to confute their false conceit of our church,” &c. (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 489.) If this be true, it makes not only to his honour, but also to the honour of the English Liturgy, translated into more languages than any Liturgy in the world, whatsoever it be; translated into Latin by Alexander Alesius, a learned Scot in king Edward's time; as afterward by Dr. Walter Haddon, in the reign of queen Elizabeth, and his translation mended by Dr. Mocket in the time of king James; translated into French, by the command of that king, for the Isles of Guernsey and Jersey; into Spanish, at the charge of this bishop, as our author telleth us; and, finally, into Greek by one Mr. Petly, by whom it was dedicated and presented to the late archbishop of Canterbury, the greatest patron and advancer of the English Liturgy. But, Secondly, I have some reason to doubt, that the Liturgy was not translated at the charges of bishop Williams. That it was done by his procurement, I shall easily grant: but, who-soever made the bill of charges, the church paid the reckoning; the Dominican friar who translated it being rewarded with a benefice and a good prebend, as the bishop himself did signify by letter to the duke of Buckingham.\*

FULLER.—I have been credibly informed by those who have best cause to know it, that it was done, not only by his procurement, but at his cost; though I deny not but that a benefice might be conferred on the friar in reward of his pains. Thus far I am assured by such as saw it, that the bishop (who had more skill in the Spanish than his policy would publicly own) did with his own hand correct every sheet therein.

DR. HEYLIN.—And as for the printing of the book, I cannot think that it was at his charges neither, but at the charges of the printer; it not being usual to give the printers money and the copy too.

FULLER.—The Animadvertor, so well-practised in printing, knows full well, that though it be usual to give money and copies too for a saleable book, which, being printed in our own tongue, is

\* “Cabala,” p. 79.

every man's money ; yet a Spanish book, printed in England, is chargeable, meeting with few buyers, because few understanders thereof.

334. DR. HEYLIN.—And, Thirdly, taking it for granted, that the Liturgy was translated and printed at this bishop's charges ; yet does not this prove him to be so great an honourer of it as our author makes him. For had he been indeed a true honourer of the English Liturgy, he would have been a more diligent attendant on it than he showed himself, never repairing to the church at Westminster, (whereof he was dean,) from the 18th of February, 1635, when the business of the great pew was judged against him, till his commitment to the Tower in July, 1637.

FULLER.—One reason why he seldom came to prayers to Westminster church was, because he was permitted but little to live there, after he fell into the king's displeasure ; being often sent away the day after he came thither : on the same token, that once sir John Cook being sent unto him to command him to avoid the deanery ; “ Mr. Secretary,” said the bishop, “ what authority have you to command a man out of his own house ? ” Which wrought so much on the old knight, that he was not quiet till he had gotten his own pardon.

DR. HEYLIN.—Nor ever going to the chapel of the Tower, (where he was a prisoner,) to attend the divine service of the church, or receive the sacrament, from July, 1637, when he was committed, to November, 1640, when he was enlarged. A very strong argument that he was no such “ honourer of the English Liturgy,” as is here pretended ; a Liturgy most highly esteemed in all places wheresoever it came ; and never so much vilified, despised, condemned, as amongst ourselves ; and those amongst ourselves who did so vilify and despise it, by none more countenanced than by him who is here said to be so “ great an honourer ” of it.

FULLER.—Though, for reasons best known to himself, he went not to prayers in the Tower-chapel, yet was he his own chaplain to read them in his own chamber. And let me add this memorable passage thereunto :—

During his durance in the Tower, there was a kinsman of sir William Balfour's, then Lieutenant, a Scottish man, (and his name, Mr. Melvin too,) who, being mortally sick, sent for bishop Williams to pray with him. The bishop read to him “ the Visitation of the Sick,” having fore-acquainted this dying man, that there was “ a Form of Absolution ” in this prayer, if he thought fit to receive it : wherewith Mr. Melvin was not only well satisfied, but got himself up as well as he could on his knees in the bed, and in that posture received absolution.



335—337. DR. HEYLIN.—But for this blow our author hath his buckler ready, telling us, that “not out of sympathy to Nonconformists, but antipathy to archbishop Laud, he was favourable to some select persons of that opinion.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. p. 489.) An action somewhat like to that of the earl of Kildare, who, being accused before Henry VIII. for burning the cathedral church of Cassiles [Cashel] in Ireland, professed ingenuously, “that he would never have burnt the church, if somebody had not told him that the bishop was in it.” \* Hate to that bishop, an archbishop of Ireland, incited that mad earl to burn his cathedral church; and hate to bishop Laud, the primate and metropolitan of all England, stirred up this bishop to raise a more unquenchable combustion in the church of England. So that we may affirm of him, as Tertullian (in another case) of the primitive Christians; viz. *Tanti non est bonum, quanti est odium Christianorum*. But are we sure that he was favourable to the Nonconformists out of an antipathy to bishop Laud only? I believe not so. His antipathy to the king did as strongly bias him that way, as any thing else. For which I have the testimony of the author of “the History of King Charles,” published 1656; who telleth us of him, that “being malevolently inclined (about the loss of the Great Seal) he thought he could not gratify beloved revenge better than to endeavour the supplanting of his sovereign. To which end, finding him declining in the affections of the people, he made his apostrophe and applications to them, fomenting popular discourses tending to the king’s dishonour,” &c.† And being once set upon that pin, (*flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo*, as we know who said,) it is no marvel if he showed himself favourable to the Nonconformists, as being enemies to kings and a kingly government, and therefore likeliest to provide fuel for a public fire. And yet, besides these two, there was a third impressive which might move as strongly on his nature, as either of them. Our author formerly told us of him, that “he was a back-friend to the Canons,” because he had no hand in the making of them. And for the same reason also I conceive, that he might show himself a back-friend to the church, a patron to the Nonconformists, of purpose to subvert those counsels, and ruin those designs for uniformity which had been resolved and agreed on without his advice. *Consilii omnis, cujus ipse non author esset, inimicus*,‡ as we know who said. In order whereunto he had no sooner heard, that there was a purpose in some great bishops of the Court to regulate the standing of the communion-table, according to the pattern of the mother cathedral and the royal chapels; but he presently set himself against it, dispersing copies of a letter pretended to be written by him to the vicar of Grantham on that occasion, and publishing his book called “the Holy Table,” full of quotations, but more in number than in weight. And this he did out of a mere spirit of contradiction, directly contrary to his own practice in all places where he

\* CAMDEN’S “Remains.”  
Historia, lib. i.

† “History of King Charles,” fol. 152.

‡ TACITI

had to do ; that is to say, not only in the collegiate church at Westminster whereof he was dean, and in the cathedral church of Lincoln whereof he was bishop, but in his own private chapel at Bugden also, where there was nobody to act any thing in it but himself alone.

FULLER.—I will not advocate for all the actions of bishop Williams ; and though the Animadvertor beholds my pen as overpartial unto him, yet I know who it was that wrote unto me, *Semper es iniquior in archiepiscopum Eboracensem*.

I am a true honourer of his many excellent virtues, and no excuser of his faults ; who could heartily wish, that the latter part of his life had been like the beginning thereof.

DR. HEYLIN.—And so I take my leave of this great prelate ; whom I both reverence for his place, and honour for his parts, as much as any. And yet I cannot choose but say, that I find more reason to condemn, than there is to commend him ; so that we may affirm of him as the historian doth of Caius Cæsar, son of Agrippa, and nephew to the great Augustus ; viz. *Tam variè se gessit, ut nec laudaturum magna, nec vituperaturum mediocris materia deficiat*, as my author hath it.\* And with the same character, accommodated to our author, and this present History, I conclude these notes ; subjoining only this old saying as well for my comfort as defence ; namely, “ Truth, though it may be blamed, can never be shamed.”

FULLER.—Here the Animadvertor doth tickle and pinch me both together ; yet neither will I laugh nor cry, but keep my former composure.

I will take no notice of a piece of Mezentism† in his joining of the dead and living together ; and conceive myself far unworthy to be paralleled in the least degree with his eminences.

However, I will endeavour, with the gladiators, *καλῶς πίπτειν*, *honestè decumbere*, that “ when I can fight no longer, I may fall handsomely,” in the scene of this life.

May God, who gave it, have the glory of what is good in me ; myself the shame of what is bad, which I ought to labour to amend.‡

\* PATERCULUS, *Hist.* l. ii. † From Mezentius, the cruel tyrant of Etruria. According to Virgil, (*Æneid.* viii. 485.) *Mortua quinetiam jungebat corpora vivis, componens manibusque manus*, &c.—EDIT.

‡ Fuller concludes this volume in a very unusual manner, by inserting four of his own letters or addresses : the First, “ to Dr. John Cosin ; ” the Second, “ to the religious, learned, and ingenuous Reader ; ” the Third, “ to my loving Friend, Dr. Peter Heylin ; ” and the Fourth, “ to Dr. Cornelius Burges.” On those to Dr. Cosin and to Dr. Burges, it will be necessary to append some remarks, for the better information of the reader.

The brief letter to Dr. Cosin, which occurs in page 669, is the only reply that Fuller returns to the very important “ Appendix ” of Heylin ; which I now proceed to present without abridgment, no part of it having been given in “ the Appeal of injured Innocence,” though it contains matters of great interest, and disperses those unjust prejudices which had been long cherished against one of the most learned and amiable divines, afterwards a prelate, of the church of England.—EDIT.

AN APPENDIX  
TO  
THE FOREGOING ANIMADVERSIONS;

CONTAINING

THE APOLOGY OF DR. JOHN COSIN, DEAN OF  
PETERBOROUGH:

IN ANSWER TO SOME PASSAGES IN THE CHURCH-HISTORY OF  
BRITAIN;

IN WHICH HE FINDS HIMSELF CONCERNED.

---

DR. HEYLIN.—It is well known to some in London, that the foregoing Animadversions were finished, and fitted for the press before Michaelmas, *anno* 1657. The reasons why they have lain so long unpublished were these two especially: First. A report that the task was undertaken by a Cambridge-man, who had more knowledge of the author whom I had to deal with than I can pretend to; and I desired rather that the burden of it, the public satisfaction to all parties intrusted, should be borne by any than myself. Secondly. There was a general opinion spread abroad in all places, (to what ends I know not, nor much care,) that the Church-Historian was in hand with a review of the work before us, in which he was resolved to make some fair amends to truth, to correct the errors of his pen, and to make reparation to the injured clergy: and, to say truth, there was none fitter than himself for that undertaking, none fitter to give plasters for the broken heads, than the man that breaks them. The poet was right enough in this,

—————*nam qui mihi vulnera fecit*  
*Solus Achilles tollere mors potest,*

That is to say,

“None but the man who gave the wound,  
Achilles-like, could make it sound.”

But the reports being thought at last to have somewhat in them of design or artifice, to stave off the business, I was solicited with greater importunity to publish the foregoing Animadversions, than I was at first to undertake them. The reader, notwithstanding, will be no loser by this delay.

For, First, it gave me leisure and opportunity of bestowing my

second thought upon the Animadversions, adding here and there some observations, which before were wanting.

And, Secondly, it brought into my hands the "Apology of Dr. John Cosin, dean of Peterborough," in answer to some passages of our present History, directed in the way of a letter to one Mr. Warren, now deceased, with a desire to have them communicated to the author of some "Animadversions" upon that History, which he was credibly informed (by what intelligence I know not) to be then in readiness. I shall therefore do him so much right as to communicate his papers to the public view; first laying down Mr. Fuller's words as they lie in his History, and then leaving Dr. Cosin to speak for himself. So doing, I shall keep myself from engaging upon either side, and leave the reader to judge indifferently between the parties as he sees occasion.

---

34—38. *Superstitions charged on Dr. Cosin. Cruel Usage of Mr. Smart; relieved by Parliament. Dr. Cosin's due Praise.*

"DR. COSIN soon after was highly accused for superstition and unjust proceedings against one Mr. Smart on this occasion: The doctor is charged to have set up in the church of Durham a marble altar with cherubims, which cost two thousand pounds, with all the appurtenances thereof; namely, a cope with the Trinity, and God the Father in the figure of an old man, another with a crucifix and the image of Christ, with a red beard and blue cap. Besides, he was accused for lighting two hundred wax-candles about the altar on Candlemas-day; for forbidding any psalms to be sung before or after sermon, though making an anthem to be sung of the three kings of Cologne, by the names of Gaspar, Belthazar, and Melchior; and for procuring a consecrated knife, only to cut the bread at the communion.

"Mr. Smart, a prebendary of the church, one of a grave aspect and reverend presence, sharply inveighed in a sermon against these innovations, taking for his text: 'I hate all those that hold superstitious vanities; but thy law do I love.'

"Hereupon he was kept prisoner four months by the High Commission of York, before any articles were exhibited against him; and five months before any proctor was allowed him. Hence was he carried to the High-Commission at Lambeth; and, after long trouble, remanded to York, fined five hundred pounds, committed to prison, ordered to recant, and, for that neglect thereof, fined again, excommunicated, degraded, and deprived, his damage (as brought in) amounting to many thousand pounds.

"But now Mr. Rouse, of the House of Commons, bringing up the charge to the Lords against Dr. Cosin, termed Mr. Smart, 'the proto-martyr of England in these latter days of persecution,' and large reparations were allowed unto him, though he lived not long after to enjoy them.

“Now, though none can excuse and defend Dr. Cosin’s carriage herein, yet this must be reported to his due commendation: Some years after, getting over into France, he neither joined with the church of French protestants at Charenton nigh Paris, nor kept any communion with the papists therein; but confined himself to the church of old English protestants therein; where, by his pious living and constant praying and preaching, he reduced some recusants to—and confirmed more doubters in—the protestant religion. Many his encounters with Jesuits and priests, defeating the suspicions of his foes, and exceeding the expectation of his friends, in the success of such disputes.” (Ch. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 412, 413.)

---

THE ANSWER OF DR. COSIN TO THE CHARGE FOREGOING.

“PARIS, *April 6th*, 1658.

“SIR,

“I AM glad to hear from you of your safe arrival in England: and I am to thank both you and other of my friends, that intend to vindicate me from the injury done, no less to truth than to myself, by a passage in Mr. Fuller’s ‘History,’ which I believe he inserted there (as he doth many things besides) upon the false reports and informations of other men, that were loath to let an old malicious accusation die, as it might well enough have done, if he had not kept it up still alive, and recorded it to posterity; whereof he is so sensible already himself, that, by his own letter directed to me, (more than a year since,) he offered to make me amends in the next book he writes; \* but he hath not done it yet. Having never been acquainted with him more than by his books, which have many petulant, light, and indiscreet passages in them, I know not how to trust him; and therefore, if the authors of the intended Animadversions (which you mention) will be pleased to do me right, you may assure them there is nothing but truth in this ensuing relation.

“Mr. Smart, who had been schoolmaster, and after became prebendary of Durham, was an old man of a most froward, fierce, and unpeaceable spirit, &c. Upon a seditious sermon which he preached in that church, (where, contrary to his duty, he had neglected to preach for seven years together before,) he was first questioned at Durham, from whence he was called to the High-Commission Court at London, and afterwards at his own desire remitted to the same Court at York; where being sentenced to recant, and refusing so to do with great scorn, he was at last, upon his obstinacy, degraded from his ecclesiastical function; and that sentence was not long after judi-

\* It is not improbable, that this letter is the one from Fuller to Cosin which immediately follows in page 669.—EDIT.

cially confirmed by Judge Dampart at the public Assizes in Durham, where he was by public sentence also at the Common Law put out of his prebend, and his benefices that he formerly held in that county.

“Many years following, he procured a large maintenance for himself and his family, to the sum of £400 *per annum*, (more worth to him than his church-profits ever were,) out of the peculiar contributions at London and elsewhere gathered up for silenced ministers.

“But when the Parliament began in the year 1640, upon project and hope of getting more, he preferred a Bill of Complaint there against thirty several persons at the least; that is, against the High-Commissioners at London, the same Commissioners and Prebends Residentiary at York, the Dean and Chapter of Durham, with divers others, whereof I was but one,—though he was pleased to set my name in the front of them all. From all these together he expected to recover and receive a greater sum of money, (for money was his project,) pretending that he had lost by them no less than thirty thousand pounds, though he was never known to be worth one.

“After his Bill of Complaint was carried up by a gentleman of the House of Commons to the House of Lords, among the rest of those persons that were accused by him, (some for superstition, and some for persecution,) I put-in my full answer upon oath, and declared the truth of the whole matter; whereof Mr. Fuller taketh not any notice at all, and therein dealeth most unfaithfully both with me and the reader of his History; for that answer of mine is upon record, among the Rolls of Parliament, and was justified before the Lords both by myself, and by the very witness that Mr. Smart and his son-in-law produced there against me; whereupon his own lawyer (Mr. Glover) openly at the Bar of that honourable House forsook him, and told him plainly, that he was ashamed of his Complaint, and could not in conscience plead for him any longer; Mr. Smart in the mean while crying out aloud, and beseeching their Lordships to appoint him another lawyer, and to take care of his fourteen thousand pounds’ damages, besides other demands that he had to make, which arose to a greater sum.

“But after this, (which was the fifth day of pleading between us,) the case was heard no more concerning my particular; and many of the Lords said openly, that Mr. Smart had abused the House of Commons with a causeless complaint against me. Whereupon my lord the earl of Warwick was pleased to bring me an Order of the Lords’ House, whereby I had liberty granted me to return unto my places of charge in the University, or elsewhere, till they sent for me again, which they never did.

“The answers that I gave in upon oath, and justified before their Lordships, were to this effect, all contrary to Mr. Fuller’s groundless reports:—

“1. That the communion-table in the church of Durham (which, in the Bill of Complaint and Mr. Fuller’s History, is said to be the

marble altar with cherubims) was not set up by me, but by the Dean and Chapter there, (whereof Mr. Smart himself was one,) many years before I became prebendary of that church, or ever saw the country.

“2. That by the public accounts which are there registered, it did not appear to have cost above the tenth part of what is pretended, appurtenances and all.

“3. That likewise the copes used in that church were brought in thither long before my time, and when Mr. Smart the complainant was prebendary there; who also allowed his part (as I was ready to prove by the Act-Book) of the money that they cost,—for they cost but little.

“4. That as I never approved the picture of the Trinity, or the image of God the Father in the figure of an old man, or otherwise, to be made or placed any where at all; so I was well assured that there were none such (nor to my knowledge or hear-say ever had been) put upon any cope that was used there among us. One there was that had the story of the passion embroidered upon it; but the cope that I used to wear, when at any time I attended the communion-service, was of plain white satin only without any embroidery upon it at all.

“5. That what the Bill of Complaint called the image of Christ, with a blue cap, and a golden beard, (Mr. Fuller's History says, it was red, and that it was set upon one of the copes,) was nothing else but the top of bishop Hatfield's tomb, set up in the church under a side-arch there, two hundred years before I was born; being a little portraiture, not appearing to be above ten inches long, and hardly discernible to the eye what figure it is, for it stands thirty feet from the ground.

“6. That, by the local statutes of that church, (whereunto Mr. Smart was sworn, as well as myself,) the treasurer was to give order, that the provision should every year be made of a sufficient number of wax-lights for the service of the choir, during all the winter time; which statute I observed when I was chosen into that office, and had order from the Dean and Chapter by Capitular Act to do it. Yet, upon the communion-table they that used to light the candles, (the Sacrists and the Vergers,) never set more than two fair candles with a few small sizes near to them; which they put there, of purpose that the people all about might have the better use of them, for singing the psalms, and reading the Lessons out of the Bibles. But two hundred was a greater number than they used all the church over, either upon Candlemas-night or any other; and that there were no more (sometimes many less) lighted at that time, than at the like festivals in Christmas-holidays, when the people of the city came in greater company to the church, and therefore required a greater store of lights.

“7. That I never forbade (nor any body else that I know) the singing of the (metre) psalms in the church, which I used to sing daily there myself with other company at Morning Prayer. But upon Sundays and holy-days in the choir, before the sermon the Creed was



sung, (and sung plainly for every one to understand,) as it is appointed in the Communion-Book ; and, after the sermon, we sung a part of a psalm, or some other anthem taken out of the Scripture, and first signified to the people where they might find it.

“ 8. That so far was I from making any anthem to be sung of the three kings of Cologne, as that I made it, when I first saw it, to be torn in pieces ; and I myself cut it out of the old song-books belonging to the Choristers’ school, with a pen-knife that lay by, at my very first coming to reside in that College. But sure I was, that no such anthem had been sung in the choir, during all my time of attendance there, nor (for aught that any the eldest persons of the church and town could tell, or ever heard, to the contrary) for fifty or threescore years before, and more.

“ 9. That there was indeed an ordinary knife, I confess, provided and laid ready among other things belonging to the administration of the communion, for the cutting of the bread, and divers other uses in the church-vestry ; that when the under-officers there had any occasion to use a knife, they might not be put to go to seek one abroad. But that it was ever consecrated, or so called, otherwise than as Mr. Smart and some of his followers had for their pleasure put that appellation upon it, I never heard, nor I believe any body else that lived here among us.

“ (There were divers other articles of this nature in the Bill of Complaint, whereof Mr. Smart could not prove any one, to which I gave the like answers, as I did here to these ; but Mr. Fuller’s *History* makes no mention of them.)

“ 10. Touching Mr. Smart’s sermon, I made answer ; and submitted his censure to the prudent and religious consideration of the Lords, whether he was not justly condemned to be scandalous and seditious by his preaching thereof ; and I represented many passages in it, disagreeable to the laws of God and his church, and repugnant to the public Statutes of Parliament.

“ 11. For which after we had begun to question him in the High-Commission Court at Durham, (where we endeavoured to reduce him to a better mind, and to an unity with the church, against which he had so injuriously and intemperately declaimed,) I had no further hand or meddling with the prosecution of this matter in other Courts against him, more than that I wrote (at the special instance of Judge Yelverton) a letter in his behalf to the archbishop of York, and the Commissioners there, which I procured the Dean and most of the Prebendaries of Durham to sign and subscribe with me, earnestly entreating for him, that, upon any due sense of his fault, he might be quietly sent back to us again, in hope that he would hereafter live in better peace and concord with us, (as he promised both Judge Yelverton and us to do,) than he had done before.

“ 12. The cruel usage and imprisonment that he suffered, (whereof Mr. Fuller taketh special notice, and makes a marginal mark at it,)

was, as I have been credibly assured, nothing else but a fair and gentle treatment of him in an officer's house at York; to whom he was committed for a while, and paid little for it. It is the Historian's mistake here to say, he was carried from York to Lambeth; for he was, at his own request, sent from Lambeth to York; the fine that was set upon him he never paid; and, by his own wilful loss of his church-livings, he gained a larger maintenance, living at his ease and pleasure, by the contribution that he got as a suspended and silenced preacher; though the truth was, that, having had a prebend and a benefice many years together in the bishopric of Durham, and being always in health, he neglected preaching so much at them both, and elsewhere besides, that he was seldom noted to preach above two sermons in a year; who, though he demanded many thousand pounds at the Parliament, yet, by Mr. Fuller's leave, the Parliament gave him none; nor ordered either myself, nor any other that he impeached, ever to pay him a groat: only, upon Dr. Carr's death, (who had been put into his prebend's place,) he was sent by the Lords to his vicarage and his prebend again; which he had little will to take, because he found but little profit in comparison of what he hoped to be had by them. In the mean while, he took up divers great sums of money from some of his partisans in London, and made them believe that the Parliament would pay them all with advantage.

“ 13. There is another marginal note in Mr. Fuller, referring, as he saith, ‘to my due praise and commendation;’ whereof he makes one part to be, that I joined not with the French protestants at Charenton, since I got over hither into France: but I would that he and all the world should know it, I never refused to join with the protestants either there, or any where else, in all things wherein they join with the church of England. Many of them have been here at our church, and we have been at theirs. I have buried divers of our people at Charenton, and they permit us to make use of their peculiar and decent cemetery here in Paris for that purpose; which if they did not, we should be forced to bury our dead in a ditch. I have baptized many of their children at the request of their own ministers, with whom I have good acquaintance; and find them to be very deserving and learned men, great lovers and honourers of our church, notwithstanding the loss which she hath lately received in external matters, wherein we are agreed that the essence of true religion doth not consist. Many of their people (and of the best sort and quality among them) have frequented our public prayers with great reverence; and I have delivered the holy communion to them, according to our own Order; which they observed religiously. I have married divers persons of good condition among them: and I have presented some of their scholars to be ordained deacons and priests here by our own bishops, (whereof Monsieur de Turenne's chaplain is one, and the duke de la Force's chaplain another,) and the church at Charenton approved of it; and I preached here publicly at their ordination.

Besides, I have been (as often as I had spare time from attending our own congregation) to pray and sing psalms with them, and to hear both the weekly and the Sunday sermons at Charenton ; whither two of my children also (pensioned here in a protestant family at Paris) have daily repaired for that purpose, with the gentlewoman that governed them.

“ All which is abundantly enough to let the world know and see here (as it doth) what a vain and rash man Mr. Fuller is in his History : wherein he hath done injury to many more besides me, some dead and some alive, who, I hope, will represent his unfaithfulness in his own country, both to himself and to others. I am only beholden to him for telling the truth of me in one particular ; which is,—that I have, by God’s blessing, reduced some, and preserved many others, from communicating with the papists ; defending the truth of our own religion (as I have always done) wherever I am ; and therein I pray God still to bless us and preserve us all.

“ And now out of all this which I have faithfully related, I trust that those who intend their ‘ Animadversions ’ upon his History, will have enough to say and insert in their own style for the vindication of,

“ Sir,

“ Your affectionate and most humble servant,

“ JOHN COSIN.”

You know Monsieur Daillé to be one of the greatest account and the best deserts amongst the Reformed churchmen in France. It will not be amiss to let you know, upon this occasion, what he wrote to a scholar, a friend of his, and an University-man, in Cambridge ; for these were the words in his letter :—

*Tuus Cosin, imò noster, (intercedit enim nobis cum illo suavis amicitia atque familiaritas,) mihi admodum probatur. Bestiæ sunt et quidem fanatici qui eum de Papismo suspectum habent, a quo vir reperias qui sit magis alienus, &c.*

Thus having laid before the reader both the Bill and Answer, I leave him to make judgment of it by the rules of equity ; remembering him of that old saying ; *videlicet*,—

*Qui statuit aliquid, parte inaudita altera,  
Æquum licet statuerit, haud æquus fuit.*

## FULLER.

TO THE REVEREND AND HIS WORTHY FRIEND, DR. JOHN  
COSIN, DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.

SIR,

You may be pleased to remember, that, some two years since, being informed by our friend Mr. Davenport, that you took some exceptions at what I had written concerning you, in my Church-

History, I returned you an answer to this effect :—" That I would make you just reparation, either in the next edition of my History, or in another book which I was about to set forth OF THE WORTHIES OF ENGLAND : choosing therein the most proper and conspicuous place, which might render it most visible to the reader."

This last book had since been printed, had not the unhappy difference between Dr. Heylin and me retarded it.

What I wrote concerning your accusation in the House of Commons, I transcribed out of the manuscript journals of that House. As for your purgation in the House of Lords, I knew not thereof : which maketh such my omission the more excusable.

I am now right glad, that you did so clearly vindicate your innocence. In my next edition, I will do you all possible right (with improvement) that my pen can perform : as also, God willing, when I come to treat, in my intended book, of the cathedral of Durham.

In the mean time, joining with hundreds more of my profession, in thanks to you for your worthy work on the Apocrypha, and desiring the continuation and increase of God's blessing on your studies, who do abide "the champion for our religion" in foreign parts, know that, amongst your many honourers, you have none more affectionate than

Your humble servant,

THOMAS FULLER.

[THE subjoined is the promised account which Fuller has given of bishop Cosin, in his description of the county-palatine of Durham :—

"JOHN COSIN, D. D., was born in the city of Norwich, bred in Caius College in Cambridge, whereof he was Fellow. Hence was he removed to the Mastership of Peter-house in the same University. One whose abilities, quick apprehension, solid judgment, variety of reading, &c. are sufficiently made known to the world in his learned books, whereby he hath perpetuated his name to posterity.

"I must not pass over his constancy in his religion, which rendereth him amiable in the eyes not of good men only, but of that God with whom there is no variableness, nor shadow of changing. It must be confessed, that a sort of fond people surmised as if he had once been declining to the popish persuasion. Thus the dim-sighted complain of the darkness of the room, when, alas ! the fault is in their own eyes ; and the lame, of the unevenness of the floor, when, indeed, it lieth in their unsound legs. Such were the silly folk,—their understandings (the eyes of their minds) being darkened, and their affections (the feet

of their soul) made lame by prejudice,—who have thus falsely conceited of this worthy doctor.

“However, if any thing that I delivered in my Church-History (relating therein a charge drawn up against him, for urging of some ceremonies, without inserting his purgation, which he effectually made, clearing himself from the least imputation of any fault) hath any way augmented this opinion, I humbly crave pardon of him for the same.

“Sure I am, were his enemies now his judges, (had they the least spark of ingenuity,) they must acquit him, if proceeding according to the evidence of his writing, living, disputing. Yea, whilst he remained in France, he was the Atlas of the protestant religion, supporting the same with his piety and learning, confirming the wavering therein, yea, daily adding proselytes (not of the meanest rank) thereunto.

“Since the return of our gracious sovereign, and the reviving of swooning Episcopacy, he was deservedly preferred bishop of Durham. And here the reader must pardon me, if willing to make known my acquaintance with so eminent a prelate. When one in his presence was pleased with some propositions, wherein the pope condescended somewhat to the protestants, he most discreetly returned, in my hearing: ‘We thank him not at all for that which God hath always allowed us in his word:’ adding withal, ‘He would allow it us so long as it stood with his policy, and take it away so soon as it stood with his power.’ And thus we take our leave of this worthy prelate, praying for his long life, that he may be effectual in advancing the settlement of our yet-distracted church.”—FULLER’S “History of the Worthies of England,” in Folio, pp. 295, 296.

One might have expected a more ample apology than this from such a candid and upright mind as Fuller’s: but when it is recollected that his “History of the Worthies of England” was a posthumous work, and that his death was somewhat sudden, we shall cease to blame the worthy old historian.—EDIT.]

---

## TO THE RELIGIOUS, LEARNED, AND INGENUOUS READER.

EPISTLES to the reader, by way of preparation, are properly placed in the front of a book; but those by way of recollection follow best in the rear thereof. If you have had the leisure and patience to peruse this book, you deserve the name of A READER indeed; and I do as heartily wish, as charitably hope, thee qualified with those three epithets wherewith I have entituled thee. I must now accost thee in the language of the Levite to the tribes of Israel:—“CONSULT, CONSIDER, AND GIVE SENTENCE.”

Deal truly and unpartially betwixt me and the Animadvertor ; please thine own conscience, though thou displeasest us ; and adjudge in thyself, where neither of us—where both of us—where one of us—which one of us—is in the right. Only this I will add, for my comfort, and thy better confidence in reading my book, that, according to the received rule in law, *Exceptio firmat regulam in non-exceptis*, it followeth proportionably, that, *Animadversio firmat regulam in non-animadversis*. And if so, by the tacit consent of my adversary himself, all other passages in my book are allowed sound and true, save these few, which fall under his reproof ; and how justly, I submit my cause to thy censure, and thy person to God's keeping, remaining

Thine in Jesus Christ,  
CRANFORD MOAT-HOUSE. THOMAS FULLER.

---

TO MY LOVING FRIEND, DR. PETER HEYLIN.

I HOPE, Sir, that we are not mutually un-friended by this difference which hath happened betwixt us. And now, as duellers, when they are both out of breath, may stand still and parley, before they have a second pass, let us in cold blood exchange a word, and, mean time, let us depose, at least, suspend, our animosities.

Death hath crept into both our clay-cottages through the windows ; your eyes being bad, mine not good : God mend them both, and sanctify unto us these monitors of mortality ; and, however it fareth with our corporeal sight, send our souls that *collyrium*, and heavenly “eye-salve,” mentioned in Scripture ! But indeed, Sir, I conceive our time, pains, and parts may be better expended to God's glory, and the church's good, than in these needless contentions. Why should PETER fall out with THOMAS, both being disciples to the same Lord and Master ? I assure you, Sir, (whatever you conceive to the contrary,) I am cordial to the cause of the English church, and my hoary hairs will go down to the grave in sorrow for her sufferings.

You well remember the passage in Homer, how wise Nestor bemoaned the unhappy difference betwixt Agamemnon and Achilles :—

ὦ πόποι, ἦ μέγα πένθος Ἀχαιῖδα γαῖαν ἰκάνει.  
ἦρ' κεν γηθήσῃ Πριάμος, Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες,  
ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροῖατο θυμῷ,  
εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθόιατο μαρναμένοισιν.

*Iliad.* i. 254—257.

“O gods ! how great the grief of Greece the while ;  
And Priam's self and sons do sweetly smile ;  
Yea, all the Trojan party swell with laughter,  
That Greeks with Greeks fall out, and fight to slaughter.”

Let me, therefore, tender unto you an expedient, in tendency to our mutual agreement. You know full well, Sir, how, in heraldry, *two lioncels rampant endorsed* are said to be the emblem of two valiant men, keeping appointment and meeting in the field, but either forbidden [to] fight by their prince, or departing on terms of equality agreed betwixt themselves. Whereupon, turning back to back, neither conquerors nor conquered, they depart the field several ways, (their stout stomachs not suffering them both to go the same way,) lest it be accounted an injury one to precede the other.

In like manner, I know you disdain to allow me your equal in this controversy betwixt us; and I will not allow you my superior. To prevent future trouble, let it be a drawn battle; and let both of us “abound in our own sense,” severally persuaded in the truth of what we have written. Thus, parting and going out back to back here, (to cut off all contest about precedency,) I hope we shall meet in heaven, face to face, hereafter. In order whereunto, God willing, I will give you a meeting, when and where you shall be pleased to appoint; that we, who have tilted pens, may shake hands together.

St. Paul, writing to Philemon concerning Onesimus, saith, “For perhaps he therefore departed for a season; that thou mightest receive him for ever.” To avoid exceptions, you shall be the good PHILEMON, I the fugitive ONESIMUS. Who knoweth but that God, in his providence, permitted, yea, ordered, this difference to happen betwixt us, not only to occasion a reconciliation, but to consolidate a mutual friendship betwixt us during our lives, and that the survivor (in God’s pleasure only to appoint) may make favourable and respectful mention of him who goeth first to his grave? the desire of him who remains, Sir,

A LOVER OF YOUR PARTS, AND AN HONOURER OF YOUR PERSON,  
THOMAS FULLER.\*

\* I do not recollect to have read a letter in any language equal to this; the composition of an old warrior, who, feeling that he had obtained a well-contested victory over his brave antagonist, could afford to be generous, and allow his captive to retire with “the honours of war.” The fine Christian spirit which breathes through the whole of this very elegant epistle, at once manly and tender, disarmed the wrath of Heylin, whose natural testiness was proverbial, and who compelled all his contemporaries

“In arguing, too, to own his wondrous skill;  
For, e’en though vanquish’d, he could argue still.”

I am not aware, that Heylin, who survived Fuller but one year, ever complied with the concluding request in this letter,—“to make favourable and respectful mention of him who might go first to his grave.” In this case, we may hope that it was fully in his intention to render due honour to the deceased; and must in charity accept the will for the deed.—EDIT.



[The subsequent letter requires some explanation, to render it intelligible. In FULLER's "Church History," (vol. iii. p. 419,) will be found "the heads of Dr. Hacket's very able speech," delivered at the Bar of the House of Commons, May 12th, 1641, in defence of the rights and property of deans and chapters, and copied (by his leave) from his papers. Fuller then informs us: "In the afternoon Dr. Cornelius Burgess, as speaker for his party, made a vehement invective against deans and chapters, and the unprofitableness of such corporations. He heavily aggravated the debauchedness of singing-men, not only useless, but hurtful by their vicious conversations. Yet he concluded with the utter unlawfulness to convert such endowments to any private person's profit. So that the same doctrine was delivered by both the doctors, only they differed in their applications; \* the former being for the continuing such lands to their ancient—the latter for diverting them to other—but neither for alienating them from public and pious—employments.

"If, since, Dr. Burgess hath been a large purchaser of such lands to himself; if, since, St. Andrew, the first converted—and St. Paul the last-converted—apostle have met in his purse; I doubt not but that he can give sufficient reason for the same, both to himself and any other that shall question him therein; the rather, because lately he read his learned lectures in St. Paul's, on 'the Criticisms of Conscience,' no less carefully than curiously weighing satisfaction to *scruples*; and, if there be any fault, so able a confessor knows how to get his absolution."

\* In his "No Sacrilege nor Sin, &c." Burgess affirms: "Indeed, Dr. Burgess did declare a concurrence with Dr. Hacket in admitting the alienation of any thing settled by Divine right upon the church to be sacrilege; but nothing else. It was far from him to grant, that all which cathedral-men enjoyed was theirs by Divine right, or to admit that it was sacrilege to aliene any other thing that was theirs not by Divine right. He intended no more in that Answer than what he had long before published, (*anno* 1625,) in a preface to a little tract of *Personal Tithes*, where he thus expresseth himself:—'To that tenet (namely, that tithes are due *jure divino*) I subscribe affirmatively, *ex animo*; but with cautions. 1. Tithes (I say not aught else) are due by Divine right to ministers of the gospel. 2. I never was, nor (I think) ever shall be, of that opinion, that all tithes within such or such a circuit of ground, now by positive law made but one parish, are absolutely and without all exception due by Divine right to the person of one single incumbent there; but to the church, in whose name he receiveth them.'—Had he granted more, he had deviated from the truth. And could it be proved by an hundred witnesses, that he fully concurred with Dr. Hacket in this point, and that sundry, who then heard him, so understood him; yet this cannot make sacrilege to be, in the true nature of it, of larger extent than it is indeed: and, therefore, if he did so speak, he must and doth renounce it as an error."

This last clause is a virtual admission, that Fuller's summary is in substance correct. But the most amusing part of this explanation consists of an addition, which he makes in the margin, to the last line of the extract from his tract on *Personal Tithes*. He had written, in 1625, that "all tithes are due by Divine right to the church." The marginal reading to the third edition in 1660 is: "Or rather to Christ her Lord, and thereby to her." How this amended exposition of Divine right was intended to aid his argument for retaining church-property, the intelligent reader will at once perceive.—EDIT.

The sarcastic allusion to St. Andrew and to St. Paul in this paragraph the reader will understand, when he is told, that, though Dr. Burgess had been chaplain to king Charles I. as early as 1627, yet, being one of those flexible mortals who hold no very fixed principles except that of caring kindly for themselves, he entered heartily into the leading views, and defended the chief measures, which were adopted, by the movement-party of that age, for overturning Church and State. He was soon rewarded for his active services, with the profits of the collegiate church of St. Andrew's, Wells; and subsequently obtained a pension from the Long Parliament of four hundred pounds *per annum* for his evening lecture at St. Paul's cathedral, beside other emoluments. This is sufficient to explain one part of Fuller's pungent raillery.

In SCOBELL'S "Collections" will be found an ordinance of the Lords and Commons, in October 1646, for abolishing "the name, title, style, and dignity" of archbishops and bishops, and for vesting "their honours, manors, lordships," &c. and "all their charters, deeds, books, writings," &c. in trustees, "for the payment of the just and necessary debts of the kingdom." Pursuant to which, in the course of another month, an ordinance was passed for the sale of their lands, &c. and to raise £200,000, by way of loan on the joint security of them and of the grand excise. In 1647, £42,000 were raised on the same security. For the encouragement of these loans, and for the protection of such as were prompted by their cupidity to become purchasers, those persons who had previously furnished money, plate, horses, or arms on the invalid security of "the public faith," were, on their advancing a similar sum, to have the whole of both sums secured to them out of the more substantial security of the bishops' lands, manors, &c. To render these sales as easy as possible to scrupulous consciences, every purchaser was to be gulled with the empty sound of the king's name, to have letters-patent under the Great Seal of England, and (nominally) to hold these grants of the king in fealty only, according to the holding of the manor of East Greenwich. For which purpose, the Attorney- or Solicitor-General was authorized and required forthwith, on the production of the deeds by those who had embarked their property on such a precarious tenure, to prepare a bill of grant in the usual form, and the Lord Chancellor was authorized and required to pass it with all due formality. But that which acted as a powerful inducement, on most worldly minds, was the semblance of the great bargains which they would afford to adventurous chapmen; the bare materials of the dilapidated edifices, and the timber cut down on the estates, in many instances being sold for as much money as had been originally expended in the entire purchase. In April, 1649, the House of Commons, then engrossing within itself the supreme authority of the State, proceeded in the same summary manner to alienate from their original purposes, and to offer for sale, the lands, &c. of deans and chapters, which were invested in Parliamentary Trustees;

and all leases granted since Dec. 1st, 1640, were declared to be null and void.

These must be regarded as final ordinances for finishing all transactions of this kind, and ratifying, as well as a single branch of the Legislature could ratify, all previous and future purchases. But the great work of devastation and of self-appropriation of church-estates had generally, from the very commencement of the war, been in a course of operation throughout the kingdom; measures having commonly been taken for the sequestration of the whole or a part of ecclesiastical property, as rapidly as any diocess fell, by the fortune of war, into the hands of the Parliamentary forces. At the beginning of the war, upwards of £17,000, which remained in the Chamber of the city of London towards the repairs of St. Paul's, was seized, according to an Order from both Houses of Parliament, for assisting them to carry on the war against the king: most of the materials also, which had been prepared for completing that great work, were converted into money, and applied to the same warlike purposes. As early in the war as March 12th, 1643, the Lord-Mayor of London and the Court of Aldermen were, by a similar Parliamentary Order, "appointed and authorized to seize, and sequester into their hands, the houses, rents, revenues," &c. of St. Paul's cathedral; and out of that fund to pay to Dr. Cornelius Burgess four hundred pounds *per annum* for preaching a lecture there, to which Fuller makes a humorous allusion. Through his powerful republican friends, Dr. Burgess procured a confirmation of the latter part of this Order, by a distinct Parliamentary ordinance, engaging and binding the whole revenue of St. Paul's for the payment of his salary, and securing to his use that cathedral, and the dean's house adjoining, in such phraseology as, from its peculiar stringency, in order "to make assurance doubly sure," seems to have been of the greedy Doctor's own dictation.\* Having managed thus adroitly to obtain the fingering of considerable sums of money, Dr. Burgess, in 1649, when church-property had become a dull and unmarketable commodity, invested nearly the whole of his ill-obtained lucre in its purchase.† Enjoying the profits of his new estates for some years, and improving his rental to the best advantage, he deemed it a duty to employ some portion of his learned leisure in attempts to correct *the crude notions* which most good Christians had previously entertained respecting the real nature of sacrilege. Sagaciously perceiving the signs of the times after the death of Cromwell, the national current of feeling and opinion having begun to run strongly in favour of discarded royalty and episcopacy, he applied himself the more sedulously to convince the world that he ought to retain all his large

\* See HUSBAND'S "Collections," fol. p. 641.—EDIT. † Wood, in his *Athenæ*, enumerates the manor of Wells, belonging to the bishop of that See, and the dean's house there, as a part of the purchases which Dr Burgess made with his many thousand pounds.—EDIT.

possessions. The title of the pamphlet which I hold is : “ No Sacrilege nor Sin to alienate or purchase Cathedral Lands, as such : or, a Vindication of not only the late Purchasers, but of the ancient Nobility and Gentry, yea, of the Crown itself, all deeply wounded by the false charge of Sacrilege upon new Purchasers. The third Edition, revised and abbreviated, for the service of the Parliament : With a Postscript to Dr. Pearson. By C. BURGESS, D.D.—*Who art thou, that judgest another man's servant ?* Romans xiv. 4.—LONDON: Printed by James Cottrel. 1660.” It is the most precious piece of special pleading by an interested advocate that was ever penned. On perusing the subjoined letter to Burgess, the reader will learn that he was filled with indignation against Fuller for the humorous manner in which he had showed him up in his “ Church-History.” But he manifested the greatest bitterness of spirit towards Dr. Gauden, who, in his folio volume of “ The Tears, Sighs, &c. of the Church of England,” had devoted an entire chapter to “ the Sin of Sacrilege, with the Nature of it,” from which I will give a few extracts ; and who had also “ declaimed against sacrilege at St. Paul's, the Temple, Westminster,” &c. To palliate, if not refute, some of Gauden's charges, Burgess asserts : “ He only spins out, more like a school-boy than a Doctor, a sharp declaration, full of personal invectives and gross untruths ; as, namely, the charging my defence of tithes to have proceeded from my desire to uphold *two fat benefices* ; whereas I have had none at all (either, fat or lean) for above these sixteen years : his taking up and publishing a false report, that I should offer a thousand marks to procure me a richer benefice ; whereas (my witness is in heaven) never any such base proffer was made by me, nor came into my thoughts. It is true, that a person of honour came several times to my house, and offered me (in the year 1640) a fat bishopric ; which when I refused, he then propounded another offer of a thousand marks *per annum* for preaching, if I would then have done what he would have put me upon.\* This is true ; and the Lord, who knoweth all things, knows that I lie not. Then, he thinks to pay me to purpose, for that I, being a minister, &c. should plead for such alienations as he calleth ‘ sacrilege : ’ as if this were more improper for me, than for him (since that) to revile and cast dirt upon the *Solemn League and Covenant of God* ; which both Houses of Parliament, yea, himself, and (which is more) his present Majesty had also religiously taken : of which I resolve (God assisting) to let him, ere long, hear more ; he being the ringleader of all those foul pam-

\* This is rather an unfortunate fact, as it serves to show a kind of general impression then prevalent, that Dr. Burgess was a man who had his price : and if the other party offered him a better price, he proved himself to be flexible enough to accept it. In regard to his *two fat benefices*, he is correct in asserting, that, “ for above sixteen years,” he had held “ none at all ; ” his tenure of St. Andrew's and St. Paul's not being in the form of *benefices*, according to the current acceptation of that word.—EDIT.

phlets against the Covenant, to entice and tempt those that have taken it to renounce it, and so to bring Zedekiah's punishment upon both king and kingdom.—If any shall thunder out volleys of eminent protestant divines against what I have here undertaken, I resolve to strike sail to nothing but scripture, or unto arguments taken thence; and rather imitate one Athanasius, who chose to go alone with the truth when all the world was turned Arian; and one Paphnutius, when the generality of that first grand Council of Nice inclined another way; than to run with the stream, or to join with the loudest outcries of interested parties, to admit that to be *sacrilege* which, upon due examination, appears not to be any sin at all." This last sentence is important in showing, that all good men of his own party disowned him, refusing to be partakers of his sin even by connivance; and he was left "as a sparrow alone on the house-top."

A few passages from Dr. Gauden on "the sin of sacrilege," will afford the reader both instruction and amusement:—"No bank or rampart is sufficient to keep out this Black and Dead Sea, when once it hath undermined the common principles of gratitude, reverence, and worship toward God, of justice and righteousness toward men: which it is very like to do, when I find Dr. B., a man of my own coat and calling, a professed presbyter or minister heretofore according to the ordination of the Church of England, who hath the character of holy orders by bishops' hands still upon him unrenounced;—when, I say, such men come to be proctors and promoters, patrons, pleaders, and solicitors (in any case) for [the] alienating of those church-lands which belonged to the bishops, deans, and chapters: the issue, indeed, of difficult, distressed, and turbulent times, which, it may be, necessity rather than choice drove some men to;—yet this in cool blood must be applauded by a grave O, that so he, a late purchaser, may have part of that blessed CORBAN which, he knows, did some time belong to his mother this church, and to his fathers the bishops of it: whose right to keep what they had by law was, I suppose, once undoubtedly as good as any that this or any man can plead for what (it seems) he never yet had possession of. Sure, it was as just for those *to have kept* their estates, as it can be for him *to get* part of it. He cannot strengthen his own private and purchased title, but he must justify theirs more who had received and enjoyed them as public ministers, governors, and officers of the church, upon a public title, both civil and sacred.—To allege that their estates and lordships were superfluous, ill-bestowed and ill-used, is to calumniate or envy so many worthy persons, (every way his equals at least,) that were bishops, deans, and prebends in England; who, without peradventure, were every way as learned, as liberal, as unspotted, as useful, as beloved of God and man, as deserving their estates and preferments, as ever this *pleader* (without disparagement) was or is, by any men on any side, thought to deserve his Doctorship, or Watford, or St.

Magnus, or Paul's lecture, or any part and portion of bishops' lands, or deans' and prebends' houses.

“For he needlessly deprecates the odium and envy of *being forward* in giving the handsel, unless he had at first some grumblings and cold qualms about his heart, as either unsatisfied of the lawfulness, or fearing that bishops might recover their places and estates again. Till he thought them as good as dead and past recovery, (as the Amalekite that dispatched king Saul,) he would not put forth his hand against them, or the spoils of them. But being, it seems, embarked in a fair adventure of some thousands of pounds (at eight *per cent.* I suppose) in the safe Castor and Pollux of the public faith, (for which the honour of the two Houses of Parliament was engaged,) he was loath to perish with his money, (principal and interest too,) or to be saved without it, as many an honest man is fain to be.—I know, his grand asylum is the plenipotency, if not omnipotency, as he supposeth, of the two Houses of Parliament, guided by the honesty and integrity of their intentions. I will with him presume, that they did intend all things for the best; that, finding *the north wind* had raised a great storm, they thought it necessary to lighten the ship of what they thought might best be spared, in order to the public peace, and that which they accounted the supreme law, *salus publica*; and, being all laymen, much actuated at that time by Presbyterian influences and interest, who promised to steer the ship much better and with more right from God than any prelates had done, they cast bishops, deans, prebends, and chapters, &c. with their houses, lands, and revenues, over-board, in the present distress and tempest,—not for that they disliked them so much, as because they could not safely keep them and carry on *their other interests* of public safety. These and the like reasons of State may possibly be alleged in behalf of those laymen, who had then work enough upon their hands, and who were to get wages to pay their workmen with the least grievance to the public. But this plaintiff, as a learned doctor and grave divine, must pass a stricter scrutiny. I will put a case or query to this great vindicator: What would he have thought of those men who voted or created themselves a Parliament,—that is, the supreme power as deputies or representative of the English people, though not chosen by the people,—if these grandees had gone on, and had peremptorily voted this good Doctor, with all other beneficed ministers in England and Wales, out of their beloved glebes, tithes, and mansion-houses? Who would have cried ‘Sacrilege!’ with greater contention of voice and lungs, than this venerable resolver of *No Sacrilege in selling Bishops’ Lands*? ‘O! but this,’ he tells us freely and with some earnestness, ‘had been *horrid sacrilege*,’ because of those [glebes, tithes, and mansions] he hath a good share; those he hopes to enjoy, together with his bishops’ lands! Thus this irrefragable Doctor resolves, that to rob the *lesser* gods is sacrilege, but not to rob the *greater*. Bishops were but Egyptians, whom the Presbyterians, as



true Israelites, might strip and spoil! So it were a sin to take any thing from an ordinary citizen and common soldier, but not from an alderman or colonel! It is lawful to deprive governors in church or State of what they have, but not the governed! Presbyters must, *jure divino*, have meat, and drink, and clothes to maintain them, that they may eat and preach; but they need no overseers or church-governors to take care they preach no strange doctrine, nor live scandalously! They must have victuals as beasts; but they need no government as men, Christians, and ministers! O thrifty project! O blessed paradox! If it hold in all societies civil and military, as well as ecclesiastic, it will spare the State many thousands of pounds upon the civil account, as it hath got it many upon the church-account. No more will there need any judges in the law, nor captains and colonels in the army: their places, their pensions, their pay may be spared. If these be necessary, why were not bishops so, for order, and honour, and government, and judgment among the clergy? But he fancies that himself and other doughty presbyters can do the work, and govern without bishops. Possibly he may do it the better, not only for his grave carriage and reverend fashion of living, for his moderate, meek, and quiet spirit, for his great learning and rare endowments, for the high esteem that is had of him; but especially because he is rich, and hath a good part of the old bishops' lands: it may be *a spirit of government* may go with them, as *a spirit of prophecy* did with the high-priest's office in Caiaphas. But as for other poorer presbyters and petty rulers, of his brethren the anti-episcopal ministers, how fit they will be to govern in common, and how well they have managed Phœbus's chariot since they undertook to drive it, I leave to all wise and sober men to judge.

"O! but his blessed tithes, his rich glebe, his fat parsonage,—these, these he challenges as his right in God's name, as *patrimonium Crucifixi*, 'Christ's patrimony,' the Presbyterian church's dowry, the priests' portion, the Levites' wages, the labourers' hire, the most holy things and utterly unalienable! Even impropriations seem to him sacrilegious alienations, derived from no other title than the pope's usurpation, annexing them to monasteries, and, by a continued succession of sacrilege, given to the Crown, and so at last become lay-fees. Thus he seems to make princes and parliaments guilty, at the second hand, of this foul sin of sacrilege; which only lies against tithes, glebes, and parsonage-houses,—the only preferment, it seems, that this plaintiff hath been capable of, or now aspires to!—Truly, it might seem venial for secular and military men, in cases of civil urgencies (and, as they imagined, necessities) of self-preservation, to seize upon the shew-bread, the priests' portion, and Goliath's sword too, as David and his men did by the good leave of the priests. But it had become a clergyman and an eminent one, who still owns, I think, his academic degrees as deserved, and his ecclesiastic orders from the bishop's hands as holy and valid; I say, it had become such an one at least to have



been silent, who is too rich and knowing to be a Leveller, or an Anabaptist, or a Quaker, or a disowner of all order and office ministerial. However, if he could not avoid this rock of purchasing bishops' lands, his modesty had been some expiation, and his silence 'a great abatement, of the scandal. He might have swallowed those holy (but now desecrated) morsels in secret, and not have proclaimed on the house-top, to all the world, the roast-meat he hath gotten, the venison which he hath taken, together with his great appetite and good digestion. The world is not much concerned to know all these things, nor much pleased at his swallowing down, without chewing, any bit of bishops' lands, or deans' houses, or a whole college, or a cathedral church, if he can compass them by his purse or policy : for, where a crumb of this kind goes easily down, in time a loaden cart with six horses may follow.—Churchmen ought, in any things of pregnant scandal, to be most circumspect and cautious ; because their example is most contagious, allowing, as it were *of course*, many grains of further liberty to laymen, who never think that their girdles ought to be so strait as ministers' : if ours be loose, theirs will be unbuckled, and at last quite thrown off. Hence many of our domestic and new-started Presbyterians, whom I well knew, Mr. C., Mr. W., Mr. S., and others, with all the SPECTYMNIAN legion, who were earnest enough at first for the pruning of the overgrown, or sear, or too much over-dropping boughs of episcopacy, and afterward they so far served the times and their lords, as to conspire to the felling-down of those ancient and stately standards in the church ; yet I well know, they never intended that laymen should have gone away with the bark, tops, timber, bodies, chips and all. No : they (good men ! ) intended very honestly and zealously, that these superfluities of bishops' and deans' estates, &c. should have been applied to buy-in all impropriations, to augment poor livings, to put Presbyters generally into so good a plight and habit for back and belly, that they might be fit to rule in common, and have some majesty (as aldermen of cities and burgesses of towns usually have) in their cheeks and on their backs : for, starveling and thread-bare governors, like consumptionary physicians, discredit their profession, and depreciate their dignity. We other poor ministers, who follow the sense of all the ancient Fathers and Councils, of the canon and civil laws, of schoolmen and casuists, of Reformed and not-reformed churches, both Greek and Latin,—we wonder what 'angel from heaven' hath whispered to this purchaser and pleader, to tell him of God's non-acceptance of bishops' lands, persons, or profession, of which He was pleased to make so much and so good use, to His glory and His church's good, both in England and in all the Christian world, for a thousand years. Yet now He is content, it seems, they should all be alienated, extirpated, destroyed, as unnecessary, yea, pernicious, to the church and ministry, in honour, order, government, charity, and hospitality : all which are better reformed to parity, popularity, and poverty ! This he reports as from the cabinet-

council or committee of heaven, where, it seems, he hath been since he purchased bishops' lands. Truly, if 'an angel from heaven' had told some divines and other gentlemen thus much, they would not have believed him ; because they are persuaded so much of the evangelical order, the apostolic authority, and the catholic succession, the prudent necessity, the honourable decency, of bishops in the church of Christ. Upon which presumptions, (if not sure persuasions,) they conceive, it had been a modesty in all learned and weighty ministers, who had received their ordination from godly, orthodox, and Reformed bishops, not to have touched so much as a shoe-latchet of what, by law, right, and merit, had been theirs ; that it might at least have been upon record to after-ages, for the honour of the English Reformed clergy in their lowest ebb and depression : *Ecclesiæ et episcoporum bona inter Presbyteros ecclesiasticos non invenerunt emptorem.*\* There is no doubt, there would have been buyers enough beside ; men of larger estates, yet not of stricter consciences. Even this great and glorious purchaser seemed not at first so satisfied as to be forward,—not 'coming at the beginning of the fair,' when, sure, the best pennyworths, for example's sake, would have been sold to so eminent a Doctor, the better to decoy-on other purchasers. But, alas ! he seems, *obtorto collo et renitente Minervâ*, 'against his genius,' to be drawn in, driven, and necessitated, at the fag end of the market, to take such eggs for his money as had been sate upon by a bishop so many hundreds of years, and may be either addle, or eggs of contention, to this purchaser, now so resolved and triumphing in his conscientious freedom to buy and sell in the temple ; when other poor scholars are still wind-bound and narrow-souled, as imagining that Christ long ago drove all such kind of merchandise out of the church, as ill-becoming Christians as it did the Jews ; yea, and St. Paul teacheth believers equally to abhor sacrilege as idols."

The introduction of these long paragraphs requires no apology. Written nearly two hundred years ago, they will be perused with some interest by those who are observant of current events, and whose acquaintance with mental philosophy qualifies them to form a correct judgment of the marked similarity to be found in the constitution of human nature in all ages, how diversified soever may be the character of the external developements of the mind, according to the various influences which are presented to it, and which act upon it as motives. When circumstances, such as those which have been here detailed, become matter of history, in reference either to individual men or to nations, it is in accordance with the best interests of mankind that they should be faithfully narrated, for purposes of public warning and instruction. Many of those who in our days declaim most loudly against tithes, advowsons, cathedral-property, &c., &c., (intermingling in one mass,

\* "Among the Presbyterian clergy ecclesiastical possessions and the property of bishops have found no purchasers."—EDIT.

with wonderful incongruity, things which stand in a very different relation towards each other,) are obviously ignorant of the origin and nature of all such property, and of the manner in which, in this free and Protestant country, it is dove-tailed among the possessions of general society, and has, in numerous instances, served as a profitable mode of investment to rich men, whose attachment to the church of England has not been very prominent. When charged with the disastrous consequences, which, in the glass of History, they might perceive must ensue from the crude and intemperate measures of their recommendation, these innocents may in artless simplicity answer, with Hazael the Syrian, "But what, are thy servants dogs, that they should do this great thing?" Whatever the modern leaders of these persons may venture to urge in favour of their own vast uprightness of intention, Dr. Burgess could plead nothing of this kind in excuse. From the commencement of our national troubles, he had chosen his party; and, with the cool and calculating policy of a desperate character, had resolved, in the contemplated public scramble, to obtain for himself a goodly share of plunder. With this undisguised object in view, he concerted all his plans, made plausible speeches concerning the abuses of the episcopal church, and united most cordially in the vociferations of the more ignorant rabble when they cried out, "Raze it, raze it, even to the foundation thereof!"

But a moral may always be gleaned from such exhibitions of principles as those which the reader has now perused; and it shall be furnished by Dr. Cornelius Burgess himself, in a Sermon, to which he gave the title of "The Necessity of Agreement with God," "preached to the right honourable the noble House of Peers, assembled in Parliament, upon the 29th of October, 1645, being the monthly Fast." He assumes to himself a style above that of any of his Presbyterian brethren—"PREACHER OF THE WORD TO THE CITY OF LONDON:" a large commission, of which he was very proud, and for which he had been qualified, upwards of two years, by the Parliamentary ordinance of which mention has already been made in page 675. It appears that many of his noble auditory, as well as the preacher, were tinctured with the sin of covetousness; for, after he had very skilfully cleared his way, he showed at length, that the doctrine of his text was "a full agreement with God," and adds:—

"This is, I confess, a plain point, but of such great and universal concernment, that should I spend the whole time allotted for this exercise in the very repeating of it over and over again, I might well avow it (as sometimes Latimer said, in a sermon at Court, touching those words, *Take heed and beware of covetousness*) to be the best-spent time that ever I had the happiness to employ in such an honourable audience, and the best service that ever was performed to you, if God should please to set it home upon your spirits. But, because such, I should soon preach to the bare walls, by running such a course.

“Another scripture you have in Proverbs xi. 18: ‘The wicked worketh a deceitful work: but to him that soweth righteousness shall be a sure reward.’ Wicked men many times pretend very fair for God: they have many specious and glorious pretences to varnish over and carry on their private interests and self-ends. They can work upon, and make advantage of, every humour, of every season. If GAIN be the likeliest lure, Demetrius knows how to raise a whole city in an instant, to banish Paul and his company from Ephesus, if he but once tell them, *Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth!* This is argument enough to uphold the grossest idolatry in the world, among men that care for no other godliness but gain. (Acts xix.) If religion be in fashion, they can, with Herod, make great show of devotion, and court John Baptist with extraordinary respects; hoping that their fawning upon, and complimentary complying with, a man so eminent among the people, may make them pass for religious men, and carry on any design under colour of religion, with which the multitude (they know) are sometimes more moved than with their own gain or liberties. But, however they may cozen uncautious men for a while, yet *mendacia non diu fallent*, hypocrisy will at length be unmasked, their glozings will be in time discovered; and then all that they have done will prove but a deceitful work to themselves, as it was before unto others. Yea, their craft will deceive none so much as themselves. Only they who are upright and sincere with God, that ‘sow righteousness,’ as men that are agreed with God and are for God in uprightness, ‘reap a sure reward,’ because God walks for ever with them. ‘The end of such men is peace.’ (Psalm xxxvii. 37.)”

One of “the uses of this sound doctrine” is soon related. Dr. Calamy, in his “Account” of ejected Ministers, concludes his discreetly brief notice of Dr. Cornelius Burgess in these words:—“By them [the Long Parliament] he was fixed in an evening lecture at Paul’s, with a pension of £400 *per annum*. He laid out all he had in bishops’ land; which, upon the king’s restoration, was entirely lost. He retired afterwards to his house at Watford, where he lived privately, and was reduced to straits. He died in June, 1665.”

‘The subjoined letter of Fuller to Burgess requires from me no further elucidation.]

TO DR. CORNELIUS BURGESS.

SIR, I could have wished, that, in your book entituled, “A Case concerning the Buying of Bishops’ Lands, with the Lawfulness thereof,” &c. you had forborne this following expression against me:—

“As that flashy, jeering author of the late-published *History of the Church* (upon hearsay only, and out of resolution *calumniari fortiter*) hath falsely reported him.” (Part i. page 7.)

Let us go back to the occasion of these words. When Dr. Hacket, May 11th, 1641, made a speech, in behalf of the Deans

and Chapters of England, for the preventing of the alienation of their lands and revenues, you returned an answer thereunto; and about the conclusive result thereof is our present contest.

<p>You say, you only concluded those things unalienable from the church which were settled upon it by Divine right.</p>	<p>I report, you concluded Deans' and Chapters' lands alienable, without sin of sacrilege, from that particular use; yet so as that they ought still to be preserved to the church in general.</p>
---	--

I confess, I neither was, nor might be, present in the Parliament; and, therefore, must take it on "hearsay." However, I distinguish on hearsay, which is double: 1. Hearsay common: 2. Hearsay credible.

I conceive mine to be of the latter and better sort. And I have no other way to defend myself than by appealing to many members of the House then present, still alive, and firmly remembering that transaction.

Surely, Sir, the Parliament never brought into question, "whether things might be alienated from the church, which by Divine right were settled thereon." It was inconsistent with their prudence; amounting, in effect, to this question, "Whether God's or their power were the highest!" And, Sir, if you concluded no more than what you say, you concluded what was never controverted by any Christian.

Whereas you call me a "flashy writer," God forbid that in all my books such a flash of folly and falsehood should be found as falls from your pen in your own praise!—"Albeit Dr. Burgess performeth more service in that church than any bishop that ever sat there." (Part i. page 32, lines 30, 31.)

I read, Acts x. 2, of a CORNELIUS praised by God for his prayers and alms: but you are the first of the name who, publicly in print, commendeth himself.

And as for the bishops of that See, have you forgotten WILLIAM BARLOW, who, in the Marian days, *exul in Germaniâ inopem vitam, ut potuit, toleravit*,\* preaching a practical sermon of patience and contentedness to all posterity, whilst another usurped his habitation? What shall I speak of STILL, MONTAGUE, &c.? What proportion, I pray, doth a petty BROOK bear to a large LAKE? †

\* GOODWIN in *Episc. Bath et Wells*.

† Dr. John Still, James Mountague, and Arthur Lake, were consecutively bishops of Bath and Wells. But the latent play upon names in this sentence, (a practice to which I have previously referred, in page 576,) will be perceived in BROOK and LAKE; and the reader will be able to make himself master of this fitting allusion, by reading Fuller's account of lord Brooke's book against bishops in pages 229, 615 of this volume, and in his "Church-History," vol. iii.

If I be a *flashy* writer, you should have been so careful as not to have brought *fuel* in your book, which I so soon may burn to ashes :—

“ And that this was the highway wherein the popish clergy of England, long before (as well as since) the Conquest, constantly travelled, take one testimony more of that famous Gildas the elder, surnamed *Sapiens* : who, being a Briton presbyter, within the sixth century, or ‘ hundred of years,’ after Christ, thus chargeth the popish clergy of his time, who had sucked their principles from Augustine the monk, sent from Rome on purpose to advance the state and pomp of the clergy, under colour of planting the Christian faith in England. For thus he saith, *Britannia habet sacerdotes, &c.* : ‘ Britain,’ saith he, ‘ hath priests, but some of them very dolts : very many ministers, but many of them impudent ones : clergymen, but very thieves\* or cheaters : pastors, as they are termed, but (in truth) wolves, standing to slay and flay the souls of the sheep : for that they seek not the good of the people, but the cramming of their own bellies. They have church-houses, but they never repair to them, unless for their own filthy lucre.’ ” (Part i. page 20.)

But know, Sir, that herein you are much mistaken in your chronology ; for Gildas died, saith Archbishop Usher, (in his *Index Chronolog.*, page 1144,) in the year of our Lord, 570. Augustine the monk came not over into England until the year 596, as is notoriously known to all that open a book.

I am, therefore, confident, that Gildas’s complaint related only to his countrymen the British clergy, without the least reflection on the Saxon, which as yet were unconverted Pagans. And, therefore, to say they had sucked in principles from Augustine the monk, is an anti-chronism which cannot be justified.

Respect, Sir, to your age, degree, and profession, charms my pen into some reverence unto you ; and because, I hear, abler men are undertaking your confutation, I add no more, but remain,

Your loving friend,

THOMAS FULLER.

page 428. The point of the remark would be keenly felt by Dr. Burgess, who with fulsome adulation courted the patronage of the lord Brooke and others, leaders of that party.—EDIT.

\* The Latin word being *raptiores*, might (by the Doctor’s favour) be better Englished “ plunderers.”

END OF THE APPEAL OF INJURED INNOCENCE.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE PLATES.

---

### PLATE I.—FRONTISPIECE TO THE VOLUME.

THIS is a plan of Cambridge, as it appeared in the year 1632, and is accurately reduced from the large plate prefixed to Fuller's folio edition of "The History of the University of Cambridge."

In a corner of the original plate was inserted the coat of arms of Baptist Noel, Viscount Camden, with a Latin inscription, which will be found concisely described at the commencement of the second plate, among the other patrons' coats of arms.

---

### PLATE II.—PAGE 1.

COATS OF ARMS OF THE PATRONS OF THE FIRST EDITION, TO WHOM  
THE VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE HISTORY WERE DEDICATED.

THE figure prefixed to every name denotes the number of the shield belonging to each individual, who was one of the original patrons ; and the figure which follows refers to the page of the volume in which the dedication to that person occurs.

	PAGE
1. <i>Honoratissimo Domino, Domino Baptistæ NOEL, Vicecomiti CAMDEN, Mæcenati suo longè dignissimo. T. F.</i> (Dedication of the plan of Cambridge.)	
2. <i>Reverendissimo Antistiti, JACOBO USSERIO, Archiepiscopo Armachano, Domino suo colendissimo</i> .....	29
3. <i>Domino GULIELMO PASTON de Paston in Com. Norf. Equiti aurato, Patrono meo colendissimo</i> .....	68
4. <i>ROULANDO LITTON, in pago Hertfordensi Armigero</i> .....	90
5. <i>RADULPHO FREEMAN, in Comitatu Hertfordensi Armigero</i> ...	104
6. <i>EDVARDO BENLOSSIO, Armigero, Mæcenati suo benevolo</i> .....	133
7. <i>EDVARDO PALMER de Waltham Armigero</i> .....	167
8. <i>Francis Ash, of London, Esq.</i> .....	194



9. THOMÆ PLAYER, <i>Armigero, Camerarii Londinensis Primo-</i> <i>genito</i> .....	224
10. Banister Maynard, Esq., son and heir to the right honourable William Lord Maynard .....	1

---

### PLATE III.—PAGE 22.

#### PORTRAITS OF THE FOUNDERS OF COLLEGES.

IN the page placed opposite to 'each portrait, the reader will find Fuller's account of the Founder of the particular College which is there described.

1. Hugh de Balsham, Bishop of Ely, Founder of Peter House, or St. Peter's College .....	22, 48
2. Lady Elizabeth de Clare, Countess of Ulster, Foundress of Clare-Hall .....	58
3. Lady Mary de St. Paul, Countess of Pembroke, Foundress of Pembroke Hall .....	64
4. Henry Duke of Lancaster, Founder of <i>Corpus Christi</i> , or Bene't College .....	69
5. William Bateman, Bishop of Norwich, Founder of Trinity Hall .....	74
6. John Caius, M.D., Founder of Caius College, formerly Gonville Hall .....	78, 189
7. King Henry VI., Founder of King's College.....	109
8. Queen Margaret, Consort of Henry VI., Foundress of Queen's College .....	120
9. Robert Woodlark,* D.D., Founder of Catherine Hall .....	125
10. John Alcock, Bishop of Ely, Founder of Jesus College .....	127
11. Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby, Mother of King Henry VII., Foundress of two Colleges, Christ's and St. John's .....	134, 139
12. Edward Stafford, Duke of Buckingham, Founder of Magda- len College, formerly Buckingham College .....	146, 171
13. King Henry VIII., Founder of Trinity College, embracing what had formerly belonged to Michael House, King's Hall, and Fishwick's Hostel .....	57, 63, 173
14. Sir Walter Mildmay, Knight, Founder of Emmanuel College.	205
15. Lady Frances Sidney, Countess of Sussex, Foundress of Sidney-Sussex College .....	214

\* In several parts of FULLER'S "History," this learned man is miscalled "Richard."

## PLATE IV.—PAGE 48.

## VIEWS OF COLLEGES AND HALLS.

For an Account of each Foundation, see the pages here respectively specified.

	PAGE
1. St. Peter's College .....	22, 48
2. Clare Hall .....	58
3. Pembroke Hall .....	64
4. <i>Corpus Christi</i> , or Bene't College .....	69
5. Trinity Hall .....	74
6. Gonville and Caius College .....	78, 189
7. King's College .....	109
8. Queen's College .....	120

## PLATE V.—PAGE 125.


## VIEWS OF COLLEGES AND HALLS.

For an Account of each Foundation, see the pages here respectively specified.

	PAGE
1. Catherine Hall .....	125
2. Jesus College .....	127
3. Christ's College .....	134
4. St. John's College .....	139
5. Magdalen College .....	171
6. Trinity College .....	173
7. Emmanuel College and Chapel .....	205
8. Sidney-Sussex College .....	214

THE END.









3 2044 038 466 397

5 1990

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

FULLER, Thomas  
AUTHOR

The history of the  
TITLE

University of Cambridge

Call Number

J51.455

C178

F968h1

FULLER, Thomas  
The history of the  
University of Cambridge  
and of Waltham abbey.

J51.455

C178

F968h1

